DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 023 781 24 UD 007 642

By-Congreve, Willard J.

Institutional Collaboration to Improve Urban Public Education with Special Reference to the City of Chicago (Urban Education Developmental Project). Final Report.

Chicago Univ., Ill.

Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.

Bureau No-BR-7-0346

Pub Date 15 Mar 68

Contract-OEC-3-7-070346-2881

Note-127p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$6.45

Descriptors-Boards of Education, Community Organizations, Community Problems, Community Study, *Educational Improvement, *Feasibility Studies, Interinstitutional Cooperation, Program Descriptions, Public Education, Research and Development Centers, School Systems, *Slum Schools, Universities, *Urban Education

Identifiers-Chicago Public Schools, Project East Woodlawn, Project Woodlawn, The Woodlawn Organization, T.W.O., University of Chicago, Urban Education Developmental Project, Woodlawn Experimental District

This feasibility study sought (a) to determine how the University of Chicago, The Woodlawn Organization, and the Chicago Public Schools could collaborate to improve inner-city public education, and (b) to develop an operational plan for such collaboration. Necessary collaborative dialogue was developed and maintained through the creation and operation of the Woodlawn Community Board, a 21-member group consisting of seven representatives each from the Chicago Public Schools, The Woodlawn Organization, and the University of Chicago. The project staff undertook to answer four questions: (a) What are the critical problems and educational needs in the East Woodlawn community? (b) What new ideas can be generated and implemented in response to the problems and needs? (c) What new ways of working together need to be established? (d) How can the new institutional relationships and activities be financed? As a result of the study, the Chicago Board of Education established the Woodlawn Experimental District and identified a stream of three schools (K-6, 7-8, 9-12) for initial experimentation. It also recognized the Woodlawn Community Board as the body which will review all activities related to the experiment and make recommendations concerning them to the General Superintendent and the Chicago Board of Education.

BR-7-0346
PA-24

07642E

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 7-0346 PA 24

Contract No. OEC-3-7-070346-2881

INSTITUTIONAL COLLABORATION TO IMPROVE URBAN PUBLIC EDUCATION WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE CITY OF CHICAGO

(URBAN EDUCATION DEVELOPMENTAL PROJECT)

ED023781

March 15, 1968

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

UD 007 642

INSTITUTIONAL COLLABORATION TO IMPROVE URBAN PUBLIC EDUCATION WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE CITY OF CHICAGO

(URBAN EDUCATION DEVELOPMENTAL PROJECT)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Project No. 7-0346

Contract No. OEC-3-7-070346-2881

Willard J. Congreve

March 15, 1968

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

UD 007 642

CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE iv

INTRODUCTION 1

CREATION OF THE WOODLAWN COMMUNITY BOARD 3

FORMATION OF THE URBAN EDUCATION DEVELOPMENTAL PROJECT 10

THE ASSESSMENT OF PROBLEMS 15

ALTERNATIVE DESIGNS FOR COLLABORATION TO IMPLEMENT SUBSTANTIVE PROGRAMS 28

SUSTAINING THE WOODLAWN COMMUNITY BOARD 41

SUMMATION 50

REFERENCES 53

APPENDIX A: WOODLAWN COMMUNITY BOARD FOR THE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER IN URBAN EDUCATION

APPENDIX B: GENERAL STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND PROCEDURES

APPENDIX C: REPORT OF MEETINGS OF SCOTT AND DUMAS TEACHERS TO DISCUSS THE AFTER-SCHOOL PROGRAM

APPENDIX D: EXPERIMENTAL SUBSTITUTE PROGRAM

APPENDIX E: CINEMATIC SOCIAL INQUIRY PROJECT

APPENDIX F: IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY AND ACHIEVEMENT IN EAST WOODLAWN

APPENDIX G: TOWARD THE CREATION OF AN EXPERIMENTAL SCHOOL DISTRICT IN EAST WOODLAWN

APPENDIX H: EXPERIMENTAL SCHOOLS IN EAST WOODLAWN: A PROPOSAL

APPENDIX I: PARAMETERS OF AUTONOMY FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL SUB-DISTRICT

APPENDIX J: MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT (First Draft)

APPENDIX K: BOARD OF EDUCATION REPORT #67-1214 and MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT AMONG THE CHICAGO BOARD OF EDUCATION, THE WOODLAWN ORGANIZATION, AND THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO (Second Draft)

APPENDIX L: MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT AMONG THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO, THE WOODLAWN ORGANIZATION, AND THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO (Third Draft)

APPENDIX M: MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT AMONG THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO, THE WOODLAWN ORGANIZATION, AND THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO (Fourth Draft)

APPENDIX N: BOARD OF EDUCATION REPORT #67-1214 (AMENDED) and MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT AMONG THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO, THE WOODLAWN ORGANIZATION, AND THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO (Final Draft)

APPENDIX O: WOODLAWN COMMUNITY BOARD FOR URBAN EDUCATION PROJECTS

APPENDIX P: INTERVIEW SCHEDULES USED IN THE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

PREFACE

This study was originated in response to the pervasive evidence that inner-city public schools in the United States are not educating many of the children whom they serve, despite the sustained efforts and sincere interests of school personnel. Evidence of the lack of effective interaction between the schools and their students is available in data reporting both relatively low levels of achievement and high rates of retardation and dropout.(9) Many of the children in segregated and economically depressed communities are unprepared for the standard expectations of the schools and see little relationship between what happens in the school and what happens or can be anticipated to happen in their lives outside the school.(1, 10)

Concern for this problem had been expressed concurrently though not collaboratively by the University of Chicago, The Woodlawn Organization, and the Chicago Public Schools. In the spring of 1965 the President of the University of Chicago established a Committee on Urban Education and commissioned that group to study ways in which the University might contribute to the solution of problems of urban public education. The Woodlawn Organization (T.W.O.) had appointed a Schools Committee early in its history to seek to influence changes in the public schools. The Chicago Public Schools, using newly acquired federal funds provided largely by Public Law 89-10 (Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965), began to move additional resources into inner-city schools including those of East Woodlawn. However, it seemed that the efforts and/or the resources of the separate institutions were not powerful enough to bring about significant change.

A proposal to the Bureau of Research of the Office of Education in 1966 by the Committee on Urban Education of the University designed to create an experimental school as part of a Research and Development Center in Urban Education was not funded. One reason given by the Office of Education was the absence of clear-cut collaborative working relationships among the University, the community organizations, and the public school system. Even though the University of Chicago, T.W.O., and a number and variety of other institutions in the Chicago metropolitan area expressed interest in developing collaborative programs, no design or mechanism existed which would ensure sustained dialogue, consideration of the special interests of each institution, and careful problem analysis. Efforts of the Schools Committee of T.W.O. were viewed by the public school system more often as expressions of hostility than as expressions of an interest in cooperative action.

Nevertheless, several small cooperative projects involving the University and the Chicago Public Schools and the University and the community of Woodlawn suggested that it should be possible to create an instrumentality for more productive collaboration. In 1965, the University and the public schools developed a Special Summer School for secondary school boys under the sponsorship of the Stern Family Fund. For several years individual professors (such as Morris Janowitz from the Department of

Sociology and Herbert A. Thelen from the Department of Education) had collaborated with individual teachers and/or schools to carry on research projects. The University also had become involved in collaborative relationships with the Woodlawn community in the areas of social services administration, mental health, and pediatrics.

Most of these beginning projects had faced the problems which were implicit in the criticism of the Office of Education in June of 1966. Planners were beginning to recognize that perhaps three institutions--the school system, the community organization, and the University--were essential to the realization of quality programs in East Woodlawn public schools. Further, it became apparent that each institution had needs and interests which could not be satisfied fully, as well as resources which could not be fully effective without collaboration.

Professionals in the schools in East Woodlawn expressed the need for new ways of dealing with institutional problems, new ways of involving parents, new approaches for working with children, new facilities, and new training programs for the staff. Parenthetically, we should note that we have not found unwarranted resistance to change among school personnel. On the other hand, we have met many people in the schools who do not know how change can or will occur.

Speaking through its community organization, the community recognized the need for new ways to relate effectively to the school, the need for appropriate resources for home and family rehabilitation, and the need for discovering methods of curtailing transiency.

The University recognized the need for live settings which are essential for relating research and theory to practice in teacher education programs. It also needed new procedures for relating more effectively to schools and to the local community in research and development programs.

Moreover, each institution possessed considerable resources. For example, the schools knew of the intensity and nature of the problems and had much information derived from attempts to solve these problems. The East Woodlawn community had a strong community organization and considerable experience in parental involvement. The University possessed an extensive research base in the area of urban education, numerous scholars with considerable interest in the field, and experimental programs in teacher education and curriculum development concerned with local school and community problems. Rich as the resources appear, as they are recounted, it is apparent that they have been and are inadequate to meet the needs confronting the schools of East Woodlawn. In view of the recent statements by officials of the federal government and other funding agencies which pointed out quite clearly that major financial resources often cannot be obtained through unilateral action, and the growing conviction that perhaps the most effective use of resources could be realized only through collaboration, the problem of how to create such institutional collaboration to improve urban public education became our major and most immediate concern.

Before the University could develop and submit another proposal in the summer of 1966, it had to establish some means, however tentative, for dialogue with the Woodlawn community and the Chicago Public Schools. Fortunately, in each case an institutional base had been established and was available at a point of initial contact. The University had its Committee on Urban Education with a chairman who was personally committed to finding ways to establish research, training, and demonstration programs in urban education. The Woodlawn community possessed a strong and militant community organization which had been created through the efforts of the Industrial Areas Foundation (directed by Saul Alinsky) in the early 1960's and which provided ready access to the community. The Chicago Public Schools had long ago established a sub-district (District 14) which included all of East Woodlawn and was headed by an energetic District Superintendent who had worked with the University and demonstrated enthusiasm for school improvement.

The forum created for the three institutions was the Woodlawn Community Board for the Research and Development Center in Urban Education (see Appendix A). In April, 1967, the name of this board was changed to the Woodlawn Community Board for Urban Education Projects (see Appendix O), but the functions originally ascribed to the Board have not changed essentially. This 21-member group, consisting of seven representatives each from the Chicago Public Schools, T.W.O., and the University of Chicago, has had two purposes: (a) to review and approve (and in some cases initiate) all proposed policies and projects in urban education which will directly affect the children, adults, community or community organization of Woodlawn, and (b) to provide a channel of communication between the programs and the larger institutions represented on the Woodlawn Community Board.

The Woodlawn Community Board was created in a context of conflict and a tentative spirit of good faith. But, it needed to have an opportunity to grow and develop into a functioning organization. The need for the project reported in this document was the first problem brought before the Woodlawn Community Board. Deliberations led to a proposal, eventual funding, and subsequently to almost a year of inquiry during which the Board grew and matured as it dealt with the issues and resolved differences productively.

The nature of this collaborative effort required many activities at various levels within the three institutions. It has been impossible to be aware of everyone who contributed to the success of the project. We do wish, however, to acknowledge the work of those known to us and to thank both those innovators who pushed for the breaking of intellectual and political boundaries and the more conservative among us who often sent the staff scurrying back to the drawing board.

The participation of the three institutions through the respective heads of units closely related to this Project was critical. We therefore acknowledge the contribution of Mr. Curtis C. Melnick, Area Associate Superintendent and, during the Project period, Superintendent of District 14, the Chicago Public Schools; the Reverend Arthur M. Brazier, President, T.W.O.; and Mr. Roald F. Campbell, Dean of the Graduate School of Education and Chairman of the Department of Education, the University of Chicago. These three men served as co-chairmen of the Woodlawn Community Board.

Other active participants from the Chicago Public Schools staff were: Miss Lorraine M. LaVigne, who served as Associate Director for the Project; the principals of the schools in East Woodlawn--Dr. Donald J. Blyth (Hyde Park High School), Mrs. Frances S. Burrill (Fermi Elementary School, 1967-68), Mrs. Martha D. Cleveland (Tesla Elementary School), Mrs. Marcella J. Davis (61st and University Unit Classrooms, 1965-67), Mr. Charles L. Feeney (61st and University Unit Classrooms, 1967-68), Miss Frances G. Granata (Fermi Elementary School, 1965-67), Mr. Raymond J. Griffin (Wadsworth Upper Grade Center, 1965-66), Mr. Yakir W. Korey (Wadsworth Upper Grade Center, 1966-68), Mr. Lawrence J. McBride (Fiske Elementary School), Mr. Seamen Peltz (Dumas Elementary School), Mr. Jack L. Perlin (Wadsworth Elementary School), Mr. William J. Scheid (Carnegie Elementary School), and Mr. Norman E. Silber (Scott Elementary School); Dr. Evelyn F. Carlson, Associate Superintendent in Charge of Curriculum; Mr. James W. Coffey, Attorney, Chicago Board of Education; and Dr. James F. Redmond, General Superintendent of Schools.

We also recognize and are grateful to the teachers, other staff members, and the children of the East Woodlawn schools who willingly participated as we collected data and warmly accepted us into their classrooms.

Many people in the Woodlawn community contributed to the Project. We recognize particularly Mr. Anthony C. Gibbs, Jr., who served as Associate Director of the Project and is Assistant Director of T.W.O.; Mrs. Ollie Clark; Mrs. Ida Davis; the Reverend Thomas Ellis; Mr. Leon Finney; the Reverend John Fish; Mrs. Valeria Lambert; Mrs. Louise Smith; Mrs. Sapphronia Terrell; Mr. Raymond Todd; and Miss Florence Young. We are also grateful to the members of the T.W.O. Schools Committee and the T.W.O. delegates assembly who participated actively in discussing proposals and recommendations. In addition, we are indebted to the parents who provided "the voice of the community" to the work of this Project.

Numerous members of the University of Chicago faculty and staff have been involved in this Project. Again, we can recognize but a few. Miss Barbara A. Ireland, Mr. R. Bruce McPherson, Mr. David O'Shea, Mrs. Jean G. Thomases, Mr. Edward S. Welch, and Miss Bernice J. Wolfson were members of the Project staff. Mr. Benjamin S. Bloom, Mr. Edwin G. Brown, Mr. Eugene Gendlin, Mr. Jacob W. Getzels, Mr. John C. Glidewell, Mr. William S. Griffith, Mr. William E. Henry, Mr. Robert D. Hess, Mr. Richard E. Hodges, Mr. Morris Janowitz, Mr. D. Gale Johnson, Dr. Sheppard G. Kellam, Mr. Mark M. Krug, Mr. Julian H. Levi, Mr. Dan C. Lortie, Dr. John D. Madden, Mr. Jack Meltzer, Mr. Gordon Quinn, Dr. Sheldon K. Schiff, Mr. David P. Street, Mr. Gerald J. Temaner, Mr. Herbert A. Thelen, and Mr. J. Alan Thomas all served in various ways during the Project period. President George W. Beadle and Provost Edward H. Levi gave encouragement to the staff and have approved University efforts through the Woodlawn Community

Board.

The secretaries who contributed substantially to the Project were Miss Irene Andersen of the University, Miss Shirley Herron and Mrs. Joan Jeter of T.W.O., and Mrs. DeVere Miller of the Chicago Public Schools.

This Project was made possible by a grant of $70,000 from the Bureau of Research, Office of Education. This we gratefully acknowledge. In addition to this amount each of the three collaborating institutions contributed substantially in time, personnel, facilities, and equipment which could not be provided out of the grant fund.

Although all members of our staff as well as those persons recognized above contributed to this final report, it was essentially prepared by Mr. R. Bruce McPherson, Mr. Edward S. Welch, Miss Bernice J. Wolfson, and the Project Director.

Willard J. Congreve
Director
Urban Education Developmental Project
March 15, 1968

INTRODUCTION

This document will not adhere strictly to the final report guidelines designed by the Bureau of Research because the project which it seeks to describe and discuss was not a typical research project. We acknowledge the flexible policy of the Office of Education which made the support of this developmental project possible. In the same spirit of flexibility, we have decided on a manner of reporting that will reveal as fully as possible what we have learned. Therefore, the report is essentially an historical narrative of what transpired during the developmental period, supported by necessary appendices, rather than a typical research report.

The Urban Education Developmental Project was essentially a study of feasibility. It was directed toward two basic objectives:

1. To determine how the participating institutions and organizations could work together for the improvement of public education in the central city; and

2. To develop recommendations for an operational plan for such collaborative effort.

This report describes how the Project staff and the numerous other participating institutions, groups and individuals, assessed the current state of educational problems in East Woodlawn and originated and tested ways of collaborating and designs for action. It describes the plan for collaboration and the proposals for action which were finally developed and adopted by the three participating institutions. More specifically, this report attempts to realize three objectives:

1. To present a statement of the history of the Project which describes crucial decisions and actions;

2. To present recommendations and plans for continued experimentation and demonstration beyond the life of the Project; and

3. To analyze what has occurred; that is, in some way to evaluate the developmental process and offer suggestions, however tentative, regarding what we have learned and what relevance this knowledge has for other situations.

Even though the Woodlawn Community Board had no legal status when first created, the Urban Education Developmental Project staff used this Board faithfully according to the provisions within which it was established. This regular involvement enabled the Board to mature into a functioning unit which in the final stages of the Project made possible an official organization for continuing collaboration for an indefinite period of time.

In one sense, the history of the Woodlawn Community Board is the story of the Project. Therefore, we have decided to use the growth and development of this Board through its discussions and actions as the basis of our narrative. Unusually complete minutes were kept of each Board meeting and these documents serve as data for this report.

Closely allied to the Woodlawn Community Board has been the work of the Project staff. In essence the Project staff was a continuous extension of the Woodlawn Community Board. It was made up of a Director who had his base in the University of Chicago; two Associate Directors, one each from T.W.O. and the Chicago Public Schools; and other community and University personnel who met and worked together regularly.

The three Directors had ready communications with their home constituencies. Between Board meetings they used these contacts to test out ideas and to bring the thinking of their institutions to the Project staff meetings. We do not wish to give the impression that this arrangement always resulted in smooth functioning. Some meetings of both the Woodlawn Community Board and the Project staff were sparked by healthy disagreement. But the commitment to finding collaborative ways to help the children in the Woodlawn schools enabled us to convert conflict into new ideas and plans.

CREATION OF THE WOODLAWN COMMUNITY BOARD

In 1965 and 1966 the Committee on Urban Education of the University of Chicago, chaired by Mr. Roald F. Campbell, developed a proposal for a Research and Development Center in Urban Education. This developmental activity was essentially unilateral. While relationships between University administrators and faculty members and public school personnel in District 14 of the Chicago Public Schools were cordial, University representatives did not always find it easy to work with the then incumbent General Superintendent of Schools. There were many reasons for this uneasiness, including the fact that the General Superintendent perceived certain studies of the Chicago Public Schools conducted by University of Chicago faculty members, specifically those done by Hauser and Havighurst, as unduly critical of the public school system.(8, 9)

The University's experience in working with the Woodlawn community was even more limited. In the fall of 1965 and winter of 1966 the University and The Woodlawn Organization were only beginning to find ways to work together on the related problems of community improvement and University growth and expansion. Moreover, members of the Committee which developed the proposal for a Research and Development Center in Urban Education were reluctant to establish close working relationships with the public school system and community organizations until the Office of Education had indicated some interest in the proposal. This attitude seemed reasonable, since research and development centers sponsored by the Office of Education characteristically had been campus-based and university-operated.

Although the University was interested in research and development activities and was proposing a traditional form for such pursuits, the primary objects of its concern were the public schools of the city and other central-city communities and neighborhoods.

In short, the University was preparing to take seriously in this particular effort what its Provost, Edward H. Levi, had said in a convocation address in the Winter of 1965:

> We must rethink the University's participation in the training of scholars for public service, not losing the inhibitions which have guided us, but recognizing this is one of the missions of scholars, and that in some areas, of which the education of the underprivileged is one, and, in a quite different way, international studies programs is another, greater involvement is required both for training and research.

The Woodlawn Community Board had its origins in a letter dated May 16, 1966, written by the Reverend Arthur M. Brazier of T.W.O. to Mr. Campbell. Earlier, May 4, the Office of Education had conducted a site visit relative to the proposed Research and Development Center. Subsequent to that visit the Reverend Brazier had asked to review a copy of the proposal. In his letter of May 16, he criticized the planning procedures and indicated that T.W.O. did not support the use of Woodlawn as a research laboratory. He deplored the University's failure to involve T.W.O. in planning the Research and Development Center, commenting,

> The Woodlawn Organization proposes that collaboration on a proposed program be on the basis of respect for the self-determination of the Greater Woodlawn Community. T.W.O.'s feeling in this regard is based on its history, with which the University is in large part familiar, and on our conviction that research without the willing, close participation of the indigenous community will be ineffective and false research.

The Reverend Brazier sent a copy of his letter to the Director of the Research and Development Center Program in the Bureau of Research of the Office of Education.

This letter stimulated University personnel to reflect upon the growing conflict and to consider alternative courses of action. After some discussion it was decided that the conflict should be viewed as an opportunity for dialogue and potential collaboration. In one sense this decision set the tone for all that was to follow in this Project. The theme of confronting and resolving conflict creatively can be found throughout the activities of the Woodlawn Community Board and the Urban Education Developmental Project. Upon occasion, when issues were not met clearly and directly, relationships among the representatives of the three institutions temporarily deteriorated.

Mr. Campbell responded personally to the Reverend Brazier's letter and before the end of May two preliminary meetings involving T.W.O. and the University were held and a larger meeting was planned for June 7 to consider an agenda of four items: (1) the formation of a Woodlawn-University policy board for the proposed Research and Development Center to "review all policies, programs, and projects of the Research and Development Center which will affect the lives of the people in Woodlawn"; (2) the involvement of community people in other than screening functions; (3) the elimination of sections of the proposal most strongly opposed by T.W.O.; and (4) an addendum to the proposal suggesting ways in which T.W.O. and the University could collaborate in making decisions related to the Research and Development Center in Urban Education.

Before the June 7 meeting could be held the University of Chicago received the site visit report dated June 3, 1966, which indicated that, while the Research and Development Center in Urban Education had received conditional approval from the advisory panel, no money to fund the program would be available during fiscal year 1967, both because of the lack of funds in the Office of Education and because of certain weaknesses in the proposal. The weaknesses were identified as follows:

1. The justification for establishing a separate school operated by the University rather than working with the public schools was neither clear nor compelling. The primary concern here was not with the short run practical difficulties of working in the

Chicago Public Schools, which will presumably be overcome before long, but with the basic strategy of the approach.

2. There was no clear plan for the operation of the school. What students would be enrolled in the school for what periods of time and for what purposes had not been worked out.

3. The cooperation and participation of local community groups had not been secured.

We are struck by the fact that the interplay between the Office of Education and the important actors at the local level was particularly effective at this point in time. For example, while the report represented a setback to the University in one sense, it clearly pointed out that the University would have to work closely with community organizations. In addition, it prompted the decision to set aside, at least temporarily, the idea of establishing an experimental school and to try to develop ways to work with the existing elementary and secondary schools in the Chicago Public Schools system.

In view of the site visit report, the June 7 meeting of University and T.W.O. representatives considered several alternatives: (1) the entire developmental effort might be discontinued; (2) an attempt might be made to define the experimental school more clearly; (3) the idea of an experimental school might be abandoned in favor of a Title III (Public Law 89-10, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965) project with the Chicago Public Schools in District 14; or (4) funds other than those available from the Office of Education might be sought to support the original plan. The Reverend Brazier indicated that T.W.O. would be interested in working with the University on one or more of these courses if there could be meaningful citizen participation and involvement at every level of the program.

It also became apparent that there were really three major actors in the situation--T.W.O., the University of Chicago, and the Chicago Public Schools--and that subsequent meetings should include representatives of the three institutions to work out a specific mechanism for cooperative effort. It was thus decided to form a joint council consisting of seven representatives each from the Chicago Public Schools, T.W.O., and the University. It was further agreed that each institution would appoint its own representatives. In addition, it was recognized that in such a collaborative board concurrent agreement by all three institutions would be necessary on any given issue. A committee was appointed to prepare a working agreement subject to approval by the larger committee. This led eventually to the formation of the council.

The first draft of the working agreement described a Woodlawn Policy Council for the Research and Development Center in Urban Education. However, inasmuch as the activity was still seen as a traditional Research and Development Center located on the University campus, collaborative policy decisions related to personnel selection, management, and budget determination did not appear appropriate to University officials. As a result, a next draft of a working agreement described a Woodlawn Community Council rather than a Woodlawn Policy Council. At this point the three institutions were not attempting to create a different proposal or plan. The focus was still on a Research and Development Center to be located on the University campus. As we shall point out the focus shifted dramatically during the developmental project from the University to the Chicago Public Schools which led to a concomitant shift in the role of the school-community-university council.

On June 27 Mr. Curtis C. Melnick of the Chicago Public Schools joined the planning committee. In discussing the working agreement describing the Woodlawn Community Council, Mr. Melnick asked if groups other than T.W.O. should be included to represent Woodlawn. However, by this time the alliance between T.W.O. and the University had been so strengthened that University representatives urged Mr. Melnick to allow T.W.O. to appoint the Woodlawn participants. It was pointed out that if too many organizations were represented they might lose their sense of responsibility. Mr. Melnick agreed, but suggested that the name of the council be changed to the Woodlawn Community Board to avoid confusion with the existing Education Council for District 14 which advised him.

The first meeting to organize the Woodlawn Community Board was held on August 24. Internal clearance from T.W.O. permitting it to participate in the Board was not available until mid-July. In addition, the Provost of the University did not name University representatives to the Board until late that month. Chicago Public Schools representatives other than Mr. Melnick were not designated until after the opening of school in September. It was announced at the August 24 meeting that a meeting was being arranged with Mr. Ward S. Mason, Director of the Research and Development Center Program, and Associate Commissioner R. Louis Bright of the Office of Education to discuss the possibility of some federal support for further development and planning. The next meeting of the Woodlawn Community Board was set for September 28.

The early alliance represented in the Woodlawn Community Board was to be tested by further conflict and strengthened by a crisis which required the Board members to act together. University representatives had met with Mr. Mason and Associate Commissioner Bright in Chicago on September 13 to discuss the developmental proposal. At that time it was suggested that all of District 14 of the Chicago Public Schools might be seen as an experimental district. District 14 included not only East Woodlawn but also the Hyde Park-Kenwood community immediately to the north of the University campus. In late September, but prior to the September 28 meeting of the Woodlawn Community Board, University representatives were preparing to meet with the Board of Directors of the Hyde Park-Kenwood Community Conference to determine how the University might collaborate with that community organization in activities which involved the Hyde Park-Kenwood community. However, University officials learned that the Reverend Brazier was not sympathetic to having representatives of Woodlawn meeting with representatives of Hyde Park-Kenwood. This feeling arose from a rather recent decision of the Board of Education to build a new and separate high school in Hyde Park-Kenwood rather than enlarge Hyde Park High School into an educational park to serve the entire Woodlawn, Hyde Park-Kenwood area which it had served for years.

The University representatives decided not to meet with the Hyde Park-Kenwood representatives and instead asked the Woodlawn Community Board for its assistance in solving the dilemma. The minutes of the Woodlawn Community Board meeting of September 28 reveal the processing of this crisis in the early history of the Board.

Mr. Melnick served as chairman of the meeting. Dean Campbell reviewed the meeting held on September 13 with Associate Commissioner Bright and Mr. Mason. At that time it was suggested that instead of developing the Research and Development Center proposal more fully it would be better to launch a developmental project to identify the relationships needed to involve the University of Chicago, the Chicago Public Schools, and community organizations in projects designed to improve the quality of urban education. The outcome of such a study would be a report to the appropriate leaders of the organizations involved in the study and to the Office of Education. Mr. Campbell further reported that Associate Commissioner Bright and Mr. Mason were interested in the Woodlawn community as well as in District 14 as a potential experimental district. Mr. Campbell said that it was clear that the Woodlawn Community Board formed the basis for collaborative action regarding Woodlawn. He said that if the rest of District 14 were to be considered then Hyde Park-Kenwood would have to be involved in the planning.

The Reverend Brazier questioned the feasibility of having T.W.O. working closely with the Hyde Park-Kenwood Community Conference at this time. He acknowledged that the Hyde Park-Kenwood Community Conference should be involved in decisions regarding schools in Hyde Park and Kenwood but he was reluctant to see the Hyde Park-Kenwood Community Conference involved in the making of decisions relating to Woodlawn and particularly the public schools in Woodlawn.

Mr. Campbell said, "The Reverend Brazier's question is a good one. I do not wish to change the structure of the Woodlawn Community Board in any way. If we are to work with Hyde Park-Kenwood, we clearly need another and separate structure, perhaps similar to the Woodlawn Community Board."

Mr. Melnick said, "District 14 has two major communities and I work with both of them. I would like to see the whole of District 14 as an experimental district." The Reverend Brazier said, "The Woodlawn Community Board has been established and is a good board. Three organizations are working here together in a friendly atmosphere on common problems. The uniqueness of the Woodlawn Community Board is that community people are really being involved. The Hyde Park-Kenwood Community Conference has demonstrated that it is not interested in Woodlawn children in a meaningful way. We do not want the Hyde Park-Kenwood Community Conference to have anything to do with what is going on in the schools in Woodlawn. We don't want, on the other hand, a voice in what is going on in Hyde Park-Kenwood." The Reverend Brazier further said, "It is difficult to imagine T.W.O. sitting down with the Conference at this point. I am not closing the door. If we can mend the fences in the future, perhaps we can work with the Hyde Park-Kenwood Community Conference, but it is not possible at this time."

Mr. Julian H. Levi of the University said, "No single problem is more significant in our nation than the improvement of educational opportunities to motivate Title I (Public Law 89-10) youngsters. Four crucial ingredients are necessary for the attainment of this objective: (1) A community where the problems really reside, such as Woodlawn. (2) A community organization with strong leadership. T.W.O. is unique and has a strong leader in the Reverend Brazier. This is essential. The Board of Education and the University of Chicago can come forward with programs which will fail unless the community organization is really involved in their development. (3) The resources of a university. (4) The interest and support of a board of education on the firing line. And by this I mean Mr. Melnick and the principals who are at this meeting." Mr. Campbell suggested that the three institutions be mentioned specifically in the proposal (the Chicago Public Schools, T.W.O., and the University of Chicago) and that the phrase "other relevant organizations" could be retained.

Mr. Melnick concluded that it was the sense of the group that all reference to Hyde Park-Kenwood be removed from the proposal inasmuch as the emphasis is to be placed on serving Title I-eligible children.

In accordance with the Woodlawn Community Board meeting of September 28 and the meeting with Associate Commissioner Bright and Mr. Mason on September 13, a proposal was submitted for the developmental project. Late in November a letter was received from Mr. Mason announcing the rejection of the proposal. The main agenda item for the December 7 meeting of the Woodlawn Community Board was the matter of a response to the Office of Education.

The Reverend Brazier served as chairman of the meeting. He asked Mr. Congreve to describe the progress of the proposal to the Office of Education for the developmental grant. Mr. Congreve reported that the proposal was submitted on October 12; that the response from the Office of Education was delayed in early November due to the reduction of Congressional appropriations for Title IV of Public Law 89-10; and that a letter dated November 22, 1966, was received by Mr. Campbell on November 25, indicating a decision by the Bureau of Research not to fund the proposal. Mr. Melnick asked if this letter represented a total rejection of the proposal. Mr. Congreve expressed his opinion that the proposal had been rejected with no encouragement to resubmit the proposal or to revise it. Mr. Campbell agreed. He pointed out that Mr. Bright and Mr. Mason may feel that approval at this time could lead to subsequent commitments which may be impossible because Title IV funds have been reduced.

The Reverend Brazier said, "I see this as a rejection, and I am not happy about it. This decision hurts the children in Woodlawn and in urban areas beyond. This is the time to fight this decision or to redraft the proposal to cause Washington to have a different point of view." The Reverend Brazier suggested that perhaps the proposal could be rewritten with the same objectives, thrusts, and mechanisms but be submitted by T.W.O. rather than the University of Chicago.

Mr. Campbell said that rejection was difficult to understand inasmuch as the proposal was consistent with the specific suggestions made by Mr. Bright and Mr. Mason. Mr. Campbell said, "I am not sure where the final decision was made, but I am certain that the Office of Education cannot afford to be without the resources we can all offer together here and now." Mr. Campbell announced plans to discuss the question with University administrative officers. He suggested three alternatives for action: (1) make the matter a political issue and enlist the aid of Congressmen in insisting on a rehearing; (2) rewrite the proposal and submit it through T.W.O., perhaps to the Office of Economic Opportunity rather than the Office of Education; (3) develop a Title III (Public Law 89-10) proposal initiated by the Chicago Public Schools but involving T.W.O. and the University, assuming that certain parts of the proposal could be contracted to T.W.O. and/or the University of Chicago.

Mr. Julian Levi recommended that (1) discussions be re-opened with the government at the highest levels; (2) opportunities be pursued to receive funding from private sources; and (3) all other avenues for acquiring assistance for our collaborative work be opened. Mr. Levi said, "The kids of Woodlawn need help and we must get the resources to help them."

The Woodlawn Community Board then unanimously recommended that discussions regarding the proposal for a developmental grant be re-opened with officials in the highest levels of the government of the United States by appropriate administrative personnel. In addition the Board recommended that attempts be made to secure private support for the total urban education effort in Woodlawn.

These two critical issues, brought before the Woodlawn Community Board in its infancy, did much to establish it as a cohesive unit. And, in a curious way, the Office of Education furnished the creative conflict and it strengthened the emerging collaboration.

FORMATION OF THE URBAN EDUCATION DEVELOPMENTAL PROJECT

Approval of the Project

By the next meeting of the Woodlawn Community Board (January 25, 1967) the vigorous efforts by representatives of the group to achieve funding of the developmental proposal had proved successful. Mr. Campbell reported that following the December 7, 1966, meeting of the Board he checked with President Beadle of the University and General Superintendent of Schools James F. Redmond and then directed letters to Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John W. Gardner and to Commissioner of Education Harold Howe, II, asking for a review of the decision by the Office of Education. The appeal was granted. A letter from the Office of Education indicated government approval of a developmental project at a support level of $70,000. Mr. Campbell reported that the planning grant did not contain any money for a facility. The Office of Education indicated that additional Title IV (Public Law 89-10) funds could not be assured for operational activities and that Title III (Public Law 89-10) or private funds should be sought to carry out the program which was created.

Yet, even while relishing their first success in joint endeavor, the news about subsequent funding led to a discussion during which representatives of the three institutions expressed differences of opinion relative to the sources and control of funds to support an eventual program operation. The Reverend Brazier indicated that the use of Title III funds might change the character of both the developmental and operational program envisioned. "If Title III funds are used and if these funds bring with them more restrictions, isn't it possible that we may wish to examine our objectives?" University representatives responded by noting that one purpose of the developmental period should be to examine all of the alternatives, and that any recommendations which emerge must be approved or rejected by the Woodlawn Community Board.

The Reverend Brazier was not satisfied. He asked, "What would it mean to the Project if Title III were a major or single source or funds?" Mr. Leon Finney of T.W.O. added that the source of the money, if we were not careful, could affect the course of our research and action. Mr. Campbell and other University representatives agreed that to predetermine the course of our efforts would be unfortunate. However, inasmuch as the grant was to permit unrestricted planning and not to begin operational programs, we should try to consider how funds could be obtained from a variety of sources and not depend on one source alone. It was acknowledged that locating a source that would provide continuity for the program might well be the major question confronting the Project staff.

It is relevant to note that twelve months later (by December of 1967) the Board was comfortable in having several sources for funding pursued simultaneously--proposals were submitted to a variety of private and governmental sources with the largest grant request being a Title III proposal submitted by the Chicago Board of Education in January of 1968. It thus appears that concern about source and control of funds may well be a function of confidence among the collaborating parties.

Formation of the Project Staff

The formation of the Project staff required a considerable amount of time. Even though the contract between the Office of Education and the University was dated February 17, 1967, and although the work had commenced prior to that date, it was not until early April that the staff had been formed and its purposes clarified both among its members and for the Woodlawn Community Board. For there was a good deal more at stake than the accumulation of people representing the three institutions. More significant was the acknowledgment of the specific interests, and aims of each institution which preceded and in some cases superseded cooperation.

At the January 25, 1967, meeting it was noted that Mr. Willard J. Congreve would serve as the University representative to the Project and would be named Director. (This arrangement had been provided for in the Project proposal which was approved in September of 1966 by the Woodlawn Community Board.) It was also noted that General Superintendent of Schools Redmond and President of T.W.O. The Reverend Brazier would be asked to name one representative each from the Chicago Public Schools and T.W.O. respectively.

At the March first meeting of the Woodlawn Community Board Mr. Congreve reported that Mr. Anthony C. Gibbs, Jr., had been named to represent T.W.O., Mr. R. Bruce McPherson would serve as staff assistant from the University, Miss Bernice J. Wolfson from the University would serve as a research specialist with primary interest in elementary education and curriculum, and Miss Irene Andersen from the University would be the Project secretary.

When Miss Lorraine M. LaVigne joined the staff as Associate Director from the Chicago Public Schools on March 15 it became immediately apparent to the Project Director and other staff members that the exact nature of the T.W.O. participation had not been determined and that equal representation for the three institutions was essential. A tripartite co-directorship was considered, but rejected as cumbersome. It was agreed that one person should be the Director, but that the representatives from the other institutions could and should serve in equal capacities. Therefore, it was decided that Miss LaVigne and Mr. Gibbs would serve as Associate Directors.

Establishing Initial Procedures

Sensing the urgency of the Project and the time limits placed upon it, the Project staff did not wait until the full staff was assembled before forging ahead. Therefore, on March first Mr. Congreve reported to the Woodlawn Community Board that the Project would be a feasibility study to determine how the three institutions could work together to improve the quality of educational opportunities for urban youth. He listed four major questions which the Project staff had determined essential to pursue:

1. What are the critical problems and educational needs as perceived by the people of the East Woodlawn community, professionals in the Chicago Public Schools, and members of the University of Chicago faculties?

2. What new ideas can be generated, developed, and implemented in response to the assessment of problems and needs?

3. What new ways of working together need to be established?

4. How can the new institutional relationships and activities be financed?

Mr. Congreve identified five procedural steps:

1. Identifying the Project staff

2. Developing a statement of purpose and procedures for approval by the Woodlawn Community Board.

3. Assessing the problems and needs as well as funding possibilities

4. Creating alternative designs for action

5. Reaching agreement by the Woodlawn Community Board on collaborative program proposals to be submitted to funding agencies.

Mr. Congreve further reported that the Project staff was proceeding on three tentative premises:

1. Each participating institution has something vital to contribute but no institution has all the answers.

2. Each institution's sense of purpose should be enhanced, not diminished, by the Project.

3. Initial efforts should be directed toward establishing effective experimental and demonstration programs in public schools.

In response to a question raised by the Reverend John Fish of T.W.O., "How will the ideas be developed and who will develop them?," Mr. Congreve and Mr. Campbell replied that the Project staff must assume major responsibility but it would be expected to draw upon the unique capacities of each participating institution.

On March 17 a tentative draft of a General Statement of Purpose and Procedures was formulated by the Project staff and submitted to the Woodlawn Community Board on April 5. That draft was essentially identical to the General Statement of Purpose and Procedures dated April 20, 1967, which is included below as Appendix B. However, the first draft included this statement:

> The Woodlawn Organization is primarily interested in building leadership for the redevelopment of the community and in changing the basic educational program so that it will be geared to the special needs of the youth of the community.

Tracing the treatment of this statement by the Woodlawn Community Board again reveals how conflict treated in a collaborative setting led to a clarification of various positions, a respect for these different positions on the part of the three institutions, and a willingness to continue working together even though the positions remained somewhat apart.

Mr. Congreve presented the General Statement of Purpose and Procedures document for discussion and revision by the Woodlawn Community Board. The Reverend Brazier indicated that the statement quoted above did not express the interests of T.W.O. sufficiently. "The term special needs seemed insufficient inasmuch as T.W.O. is really interested in a basic change in the educational system." The Reverend Brazier said, further, "Too many young people have severe difficulty getting through elementary school and being prepared for high school. This is not always due to a lack of motivation on the part of the student. We need real, meaningful, intensive change in our schools, not only for Chicago but beyond."

Mr. Norman E. Silber, a Chicago Public Schools principal, suggested that the word special be eliminated. The Reverend Brazier pointed out that he did not want the interests of T.W.O. to be seen as superficial, or concerned with only compensatory programs. Mr. Melnick said that the Reverend Brazier seemed to be expressing an interest in changes in the basic curricula and in the day-to-day operation of the schools. The Reverend Brazier concurred and added, "We're not very far apart, but we do want to make certain that the interests of T.W.O. are spelled out fully and correctly. Perhaps we can work with the Project staff to make the changes necessary in the statement." The Reverend Fish added that we must move toward giving the community a more significant voice in the guidance of the schools as they affect the community. After receiving other suggestions for changes in the wording, it was agreed that the Project staff would meet with the Reverend Brazier and bring a revised statement to a future meeting of the Woodlawn Community Board.

The rewriting was accomplished by the Project Director, the Reverend Brazier, and Mr. Gibbs. It reflected the insistence of T.W.O. to focus upon basic changes in the school. As amended it read:

> 2. The Woodlawn Organization is primarily interested in building leadership for the redevelopment of the community and in changing the basic educational program and the allocation of resources so that the educational system will be geared to the needs of the youth and the community.

When presented to the Woodlawn Community Board at the May 3 meeting, this statement did not receive the endorsement of every member. Mr. Silber asked for further explanation of the phrase "changing the basic educational program." The Reverend Brazier responded that this statement refers to the "development of programs that would give the Negro a better understanding of his contribution to the growth of the American society. Many Negroes labor under a self-hatred concept; yet few of the materials used in school reveal the Negro as a contributor to his country. The Negroes who are pictured and discussed in school books are those Negroes who are acceptable to whites." Mr. Silber commented that he still did not fully understanding the meaning of the phrase. The Reverend Fish said, "It means that the educational program in the slum school has failed." The Reverend Brazier commented on the recent study by the United States Commission on Civil Rights, Racial Isolation in the Schools, (13) which indicated that compensatory programs in segregated schools are not doing the job. He said, "Something different must be done to meet the needs of our children." Mr. Jack L. Perlin of the Chicago Public Schools said, "We have all failed the kids. What we are working on now is a coalition of institutions that will make some changes." Mr. Campbell pointed out that the phrase in question indicates the position or special interest of The Woodlawn Organization, not of each component group. Mr. Seamen Peltz of the Chicago Public Schools added, "The phrase is essentially a statement of T.W.O. It should be accepted as part of the entire document if it is what they desire." A motion was then offered that the General Statement of Purpose and Procedures as revised and dated April 20, 1967, be approved. The motion was passed unanimously.

After this meeting the Project staff moved ahead with noticeably more vigor and confidence, satisfied that basic directions had been established and that at least certain of the fundamental motives of the institutional partners in collaboration had been made explicit and discussed openly. This basic position of T.W.O. was eventually respected in the final proposals developed by the Project staff and discussed and affirmed by the Board. But the issue of piecemeal change versus total and basic change was to recur frequently in ensuing discussions in the summer and autumn.

THE ASSESSMENT OF PROBLEMS

Even though the final version of the General Statement of Purpose and Procedures was not adopted by the Woodlawn Community Board until May 3, 1967, the Project staff felt impelled to move ahead on the assessment of needs in Woodlawn schools prior to that date. Therefore, by the end of March, plans to initiate the assessment were well underway. Sources of data were to include: (1) the perceptions and opinions of individuals in the schools and in the neighborhood as well as on the University campus; (2) school system files; and (3) visits by staff members to programs similar to the Urban Education Developmental Project in other cities of the nation. The data collected were to be interpreted in light of knowledge available from previous studies of inner-city education in Chicago and elsewhere.

As already pointed out, the activities of this Project involved many tests of collaboration. In a sense this assessment program provided one such test and perhaps the first most serious test. Unless the public school system was willing to permit both self-scrutiny and public scrutiny by representatives of T.W.O. and the University, the assessment could not have been made. Conversely, unless T.W.O. and University representatives proceeded with integrity, the Project might founder.

At the April 5 meeting of the Woodlawn Community Board the Project Director reported that a pilot study would be conducted at the Fiske School and in the Fiske community. Thereafter, three other elementary schools (Scott, Carnegie, and Wadsworth), one upper grade center (Wadsworth), and one high school (Hyde Park) would be included. Randomly selected children, parents, and teachers, other school staff members, and all principals and assistant principals were to be asked to respond to a structured interview schedule designed to elicit opinions about what problems existed as well as suggestions to alleviate these problems.

In Making this report, Mr. Congreve acknowledged the openness, receptivity, and interest of Mr. Melnick; Mr. Lawrence J. McBride, the Fiske School principal; and the faculty of Fiske School. "No one is denying that problems exist. Rather, the search now is for an accurate statement of the problems and ideas for meeting them."

On May 3, when the Woodlawn Community Board convened next, Mr. Congreve reviewed the progress of the assessment program. Among other things he reported successful completion of the pilot study at the Fiske School, the approval of the interview schedules by the Office of Education, and the initiation of interviews in the community as well as with University persons. He expressed the hope that preliminary findings could be presented to the Woodlawn Community Board in June. Mr. Congreve noted that although all respondents were most cooperative there was considerable feeling among teachers and principals that too much research has been done in ghetto communities and schools serving these communities and too little subsequent action. Already teachers and principals were urging the Project staff to search for clear, positive programs of school improvement. In concluding his report, the Project Director reminded the Board that the prime objective of the Urban Education Developmental Project is "to test the feasibility of working together" through the design of specific action programs. He added, "We will find unfavorable things as we visit the schools, but this is to be expected. However, our purpose is positive, and we must not lose sight of this point."

By the June 7 meeting of the Woodlawn Community Board the assessment had proceeded sufficiently to allow the Project Director to make a reasonably complete preliminary report. Rather than present the preliminary report as recorded in the Board minutes, we have chosen to include the complete report which was prepared after all the data were in. This report also provides the background necessary to understand the intervention plans developed subsequently and presented later in this report.

Method of the Study

The intent of this study was to enable the planning group to understand more fully the particular problems and circumstances for which they were to design remediation programs. They decided this understanding could be gained only by asking the people in the East Woodlawn schools and in the community to express their perceptions of the problems in the schools.

The full- and part-time members (seven) on the Project staff at the time of the study participated as interviewers. Five open-ended structured interview forms were constructed, one for each of five categories of individuals contacted: students, teachers, principals, parents, and clerical and other staff (see Appendix P).

The open-ended structured interview questionnaires were prepared by Project staff members assisted by University consultants and knowledge from such research as is reported in the Coleman report.(3) The questions were designed to release a free flow of thoughts from the respondents. The responses were recorded by the interviewer during the interview; in some cases, the interviews were taped. The instruments were pretested at one elementary school (Fiske) and at a high school located outside of Woodlawn. The pilot testing experience suggested a reduction in the number of items on each interview schedule. It was also decided that all respondents were best contacted in the school during school hours except for parents who were to be interviewed in their own homes. Project staff members were the most effective interviewers except in the case of parents who were interviewed by one of two community members hired for that purpose. Of the five categories of respondents, the students seemed to respond more easily in small groups rather than individually.

In each of the five categories of individuals concerned with school improvement, the following numbers were interviewed:

Administrators	10
Teachers	34

Clerical and other staff	16
Students	84
Parents	20
Total	164

The respondents were selected by stratified random sample except in the case of administrators, all of whom were interviewed. Respondents in each category were distributed about evenly for each of the five schools; the parent sample was drawn from the Woodlawn community in general, without regard to school-area boundaries. The five schools studied were Hyde Park High School (9-12), Wadsworth Upper Grade Center (7-8), Wadsworth Elementary (K-6), Scott Elementary (K-6), and Carnegie Elementary (K-6). These five schools were considered to be generally representative of all Woodlawn schools.

After an interview was completed, the interviewer coded each response into categories of the problems identified. (Because of the open-ended nature of the questions, a respondent could identify several problems in one response.) Each problem was then placed on a separate index card which permitted sorting and resorting of the data. Considerable variation existed in the number of responses for each respondent, the number of responses often being contingent on his degree of verbal responsiveness in the interview. All the cards representing interview responses in each of the five respondent categories were pooled. No controls were established to keep the more loquacious respondents from being disproportionately influential in the total picture for their respondent category. However, this was not seen as a major concern inasmuch as the purpose of this study was to identify the kinds of problems people were aware of and most concerned about. When all the interview data had been transcribed on the cards, the Project staff began the task of classifying the data and interpreting the particular problems identified.

A total of 40 "problem areas" was identified by one or more of the respondents. Of these 40 areas, 20 were named by 40 per cent or more of the respondents in any category. These were accepted as important problems and became the basis for this report.

Several attempts were made to find a framework into which the assessment findings could be fitted with minimal distortion of results and maximal utility from the standpoint of ultimate intervention and remediation. Categorizing the problems identified by each of the five groups of respondents made for redundancy, inasmuch as similar problems were identified by more than one category of respondent. Categorization of problems on the basis of the implicit character of the problem was deemed a more constructive approach. Eight such categories were initially constructed: (1) problems of role definition-allocation of staff time; (2) problems of physical resources; (3) problems of personnel resources; (4) problems of attitudes; (5) problems of communicating information; (6) problems relating to involvement for decision-making; (7) problems relating to teaching-learning; and (8) problems external to the school.

Although this framework reduced overlap, its underlying rationale failed to address the issue of intervention and remediation. For example, problems of role conflict due to inadequate definition may occur in a variety of situations which may be quite dissimilar with respect to individuals, issues, and organizational relationships. Therefore, in attempting to reduce a role conflict between teachers and school clerks the action necessary might be considerably different from that necessary to establish the appropriate role for school-community representatives.

Constant re-examination of the preliminary categories and the data in light of available knowledge gradually led the Project staff to the realization that the problems belonged logically in two broad categories: administrative and teaching-learning. Into the first were placed problems of physical facilities and space, as well as administrative and staff relations. The second embraced problems centered in the home and community, as well as problems centered in the school, all of which impinged upon the teaching-learning process. In addition to being logical, the two categories suggest possible correctional intervention techniques which might be employed, at least experimentally, to alleviate the problems.

With regard to the first category, considerable knowledge is already available as to what can be done to begin to solve administrative problems. With adequate funds there are numerous ways to remedy problems of inadequate facilities. Furthermore, much administrative theory is already available which can assist in fashioning programs to correct organizational problems related to staff relations and the effective utilization of personnel.

The second category takes cognizance of the inseparable relationships among the home, school, and community as they provide experiences by which children learn. Bloom (2), Coleman (3), and others have pointed out that when the school and home provide incongruent orientations to learning the effect of each is reduced. Furthermore, in such contests, the school usually comes out second best. While much research still needs to be done to learn how the home, the school, and the community can provide an integrated experience for children, this category recognizes the need for experimental interventions which will focus on the home and community as well as on the learning environment in the school.

Findings of the Study

The assessment findings identify the important impediments to a good school as perceived by respondents within both the school and the community and by members of age and occupation groupings as widely divergent as student (elementary and high school), lunchroom manager, teacher, and school administrator. However, the findings in no sense can be interpreted as a comprehensive analysis of the schools of the total Woodlawn area of Chicago. Nor is it appropriate to consign all of the deficiencies reported to each and every school in East Woodlawn. Indeed, the very purpose of this effort was to identify problem areas in the East

Woodlawn schools which would bear further study as suggestions for intervention and remediation are devised and tested.

The findings are more accurately portrayed by a profile of problem areas than they could be by statistical treatment. Indeed, the number of respondents was small enough so that within each area, with few exceptions, the number of individuals identifying similar problems was of doubtful statistical significance.

It is also important to point out that because of the intent of the study it did not attempt a summation of the many fine things which are going on in the schools. Thus, the report is biased against positive programs and in favor of problems because we set out to identify problems. Yet, we were not on a hunting expedition. The assessment was done in a spirit of helpfulness. We told the teachers, principals, and students that we wanted them to help identify problems and make suggestions for their amelioration, in the hope that together we could find ways to improve educational opportunities for the children in East Woodlawn schools.

In spite of the focus on problems, the Project staff uncovered many promising programs in the schools. Although no purpose can be served by focussing upon these programs from this point forward, a brief mention of some of them will keep the perspectives of this assessment report in balance. We found, for example, continuous development programs and lowered class sizes in grades one and two; special instructional groups for reading and arithmetic; assembly programs and field trips designed to broaden horizons and motivate children; after-school social centers; and health screening programs.

We also found that the schools were taking advantage of the additional resources which were becoming available through sources other than local financing. The schools contained special programs in reading and music financed by federal funds; National Teacher Corps programs; School Social Worker programs; the latest in teaching equipment including a closed-circuit television system in the process of installation; and experimental programs in reading, grouping, and mental health. It was apparent that the East Woodlawn schools were not merely accepting the status quo. In spite of limited resources and many problems the teachers were doing the best they could to meet the educational needs of the children entering their schools.

As we turn our attention to these problems, we remind the reader that all of the deficiencies reported do not exist in all of the schools studied. Rather, all schools have some inadequacies, but no one school is plagued by all of them.

1. The Administrative Domain

a. Physical Attributes of the School Plant

Respondents frequently cited deficiencies in the availability, distribution, and allocation of such basic essentials as floorspace, furniture, and instructional materials. Even though some classrooms and book storage closets contained many books, those available were often outdated and/or lacked relevance to the inner-city child. In addition, supplementary materials such as workbooks were frequently in short supply.

Undersized or non-existent libraries in some schools were seen as contributing to student disinterest in outside reading and to their disrespect for books. Where available, all-purpose rooms and combinations of lunchroom and library were cited as ineffective in either capacity because of excessive use. Some gymnasiums were described as too small and poorly equipped. Art, science, music, shop, and guidance facilities were usually inadequate. Either no area had been set aside to meet the required ments of the special subject, or the areas provided were too small to meet the demands placed upon them.

Recreation and relaxation areas for both student and staff were cited as woefully inadequate. There was frequent mention of cramped playgrounds and lack of playground equipment. Teacher lounges and preparation areas were described as primitive or non-existent. Student health facilities were cited as substandard in several instances. Several administrators and other staff members reported that lack of sufficient office space, storage facilities, and record-keeping facilities seriously hampered their operations.

b. Organizational Structure

Under organizational structure we include problems arising from the interaction of school personnel, which may or may not be related to the physical structure of the school. We do not suggest that the administrator is solely responsible for their existence. Rather, we assign to the school administrator the primary responsibility for identifying such problems and for seeking the necessary resources to deal with them.

The findings revealed three problem areas germane to organization: inadequate role definition, lack of adequate personnel resources, and lack of adequate administrative skills to meet the demands of the institution.

(1) Role definition. For the most part it was the teachers who reported unclear definitions of the roles of a number of school personnel, themselves included. Teachers reported that they had little time to teach because they were frequently engaged in such non-teaching tasks as clerical duties, lunchroom duty, hall duty, playground supervision, and washroom surveillance. (On November 1, 1967, some teacher aide positions were created to help alleviate this problem.) They also mentioned lack of time to develop ideas, to meet with their peers, and to share in curriculum development or in coordinating their efforts. Most teachers cited non-teaching responsibilities as responsible for their lack of preparation time. However, several recommended a reduction in the number of classes or preparations per day, indicating that professional planning was limited by teaching as well as non-teaching activities.

(2) Personnel resources. Respondents from every category cited the need for more qualified adults to work with the children. Almost everyone indicated a need for reducing class size. Several respondents called for more superior teaching personnel, more support for new teachers, and conditions which would discourage high teacher turnover. Suggestions for improvement included providing highly trained subject specialists and other resource people to assist the teachers. Several specific suggestions indicated that many teachers could profit from the assistance of human relations specialists.

School psychologists, clerks, and engineer-custodians indicated a need for more personnel in their own fields. Some school clerks, particularly, felt that they had not been trained to deal with the wide variety of tasks which had fallen to them.

A number of teachers reported dissatisfaction with the number and calibre of consultants, specialists, guidance personnel, and clerical assistants. They also cited the need for additional personnel who could improve school-community relations, function as clerical aides, supervise the playground, and patrol the school hallways.

These data support the need for a number of people who are skilled to do the variety of jobs which need to be done. Teachers readily indicated that they had neither the skills nor the time to perform tasks which were not directly related to assisting and supervising the teaching-learning process.

(3) Administrative skills. Improved administrative skills seem to be needed, especially in the areas of decision-making and communications. Lack of involvement in making decisions affecting themselves was cited as a serious weakness by both teachers and administrators. Respondents cited many instances of programs which were planned and organized exclusively by central office staff but had little relevance to the needs of a particular school. Central office decisions to invest federal funds in programs or equipment often resulted in schools getting items for which they had little or no use.

The situation within the school was little better. Teachers expressed dissatisfaction with the disjointedness of curriculum planning and program implementation. Reasons cited were ill-defined responsibilities for decision-making and clogged channels of communication. A number of teachers felt they should have a greater hand in making decisions; others felt that the principal should be the decision-maker within the school. All respondents were critical of decisions which were made unilaterally at the district and/or central office level.

Closely related to decision-making was the need for improved two-way communication between upper and lower echelon personnel and also among peer colleagues. While the maintenance of conditions which facilitate such communication was cited as the responsibility of each individual in the system, the school administrator was seen as the person who should monitor the channels of communication and provide such guidance and assistance as necessary to keep them open.

Several instances of poor communication between the administrator and teachers were reported. Spur-of-the-moment faculty meetings, inefficient record systems, failure of the school office to notify teachers of schedule changes, and failure of the principal to orient new teachers to the resources available in the school were identified as specific problems.

Poor communication between and among teachers and other school personnel was also identified as a problem. Several teachers felt that they received cold and impersonal treatment by central office staff and were ignored by their own principal. In addition, respondents reported friction and mutual feelings of mistrust among classroom teachers and between the classroom teachers and teachers of the so-called special subjects. Some respondents indicated disagreements among teachers as an underlying cause of internal friction. For example, some teachers felt that rules should be made and then followed, that teachers should have uniformly high standards. Others felt that the present rules were too rigid and were driving out imaginative young people.

2. The Teaching-Learning Domain

Earlier in this part of the report we suggested that the teaching-learning domain was complex and involved the home, community, and school. The learning process, taken in its broadest sense, is not limited by geographic or environmental considerations. To a certain extent, some behaviors are learned in the home, particularly if the home is in the middle socio-economic stream of society. Others are learned primarily in the school. Dreeben (5) identifies these primary school learned behaviors to be independence, achievement, universalism, and specificity. The child from the home where learning is valued by the parents will find the school supportive of interpersonal norms he has learned at home while at the same time the school helps the child develop a repertoire of social norms of which his parents are supportive.

Davis (4) and more recently Riessman (11) have pointed out that for the child from the family living on welfare, the lowest socio-economic stratum we have a label for, the probability that he will "make good" in school and break the lockstep pattern of poverty is quite small. Yet these children learn to survive in the ghetto through learning experiences which occur outside of school but are not dominated by the home. Rather, they are activities of the street, the vacant lot, and the entry ways of tenements.

Too often in the past, finger pointing by the school or the parent has sought to locate the origin of the child's learning difficulties in a single institution: the home, the community, the school, or the child. Our data point out quite clearly that learning difficulties cannot be viewed as stemming from one single source. In categorizing the data in this way we hope to avoid indicting anyone. Furthermore, we hope that it will provide clues for experimental interventions in which the home, the school, and the community can collaborate as remediating agencies.

a. Teaching-Learning: Home and Community

Teaching-learning problems related to the home fall into several overlapping categories. Some are primarily related to the physical environment, others to the attitudes of parent and child, and still others to the behavior of the parent and the child.

The key physical environment problems reported indicated the need for improved living conditions, better diet, adequate clothing, and a suitable home atmosphere in which the child could do his work without distraction or interruption. While these physical environment problems contribute to teaching-learning problems, they appear to be secondary to the attitudinal and behavioral characteristics of the home and community. Nevertheless, the physical conditions encourage attitudes and behaviors which interfere with school learning.

The presence of gangs in the community was cited as a major deterrent to learning. Gang members often threatened children on their way to and from school, but at the same time they provided an attractive alternative to older children which contributed to their growing disinterest in school. Several respondents indicated that the gangs contributed to high student mobility. Many parents reportedly moved frequently in an attempt to find a healthier neighborhood for their children.

Most student respondents spoke cautiously about gangs. They described them as powerful (though not necessarily "bad") agencies. (They may have been afraid to speak out otherwise.)

Behavior which reflects undesirable attitudes on the part of parents was also cited as a problem. This problem had two major dimensions: parent apathy toward the school (parents who did not seem to care about what the school was trying to do for their children) and, on the other hand, parent hostility toward the school, usually borne of misunderstanding of the school's aims. Several respondents identified differential value orientations of parents and teacher as contributors to the gap between school and home.

Several respondents suggested that the schools bore a heavy burden of responsibility for whatever hostility might exist between home and school. Therefore, the school should address itself to the task of improving its image in the community. Inasmuch as good works precede good feelings, these respondents called for the school to take active steps to make a positive impact on the community.

Several parents indicated that improved communications between the home and the school could change the image of the school in the community. These parents were critical of what appeared to them to be a lack of interest on the part of principals and teachers in the problems of the child and adult in the ghetto. As one evidence of the school's indifference they pointed to the slowness with which truancy problems were identified and brought to the attention of the parents.

b. Teaching-Learning: School

In this area we have grouped those problems which impinge more or less directly on teaching-learning activities having their locus in the school. Three sub-categories will be considered: teacher-centered problems, student-centered problems, and program-centered problems. Each of these sub-categories will be considered in turn, the last first.

(1) Program-centered problems. In the program sub-area two main criticisms were advanced: lack of program versatility with respect to curriculum, and administrative inflexibility with respect to grouping of students and allocation of instructional time. Respondents suggested that the programs and curricula now used are either out-of-date or irrelevant to the inner-city child. Several indicated a lack of attention to aspects of life which are of particular importance to the Negro. Others felt that college-oriented programs should be replaced or at least supplemented with programs more useful to the average student. Several respondents indicated that there are too few special education classes to meet the needs which exist. Another, in reference to the after-school program (Title I, Public Law 89-10), called it "just more of the same."

In the instance of administrative flexibility, several teachers indicated dissatisfaction with the rigid grouping systems. Several felt the classes were too large. Others indicated the problem lay in the composition of the classes. Placing readers with non-readers, normal children with those with emotional problems, and boys with girls were among the problems mentioned. One respondent objected to the placing of all the failures in one class; another felt that each classroom should have an equal number of boys and girls. Teachers seemed to be questioning most of the conventional grouping practices of the schools, both elementary and secondary. Again, the responses point not toward identifying workable grouping practices but, rather, they document the fact that the present methods of distributing students and teachers seem inadequate for the tasks assigned to the school.

Another category of responses dealt with the existing red tape and regulations which prevented or restricted the teacher from exploiting existing opportunities. Being unable to use the library with primary grades or having to make complicated arrangements to take field trips were two cases in point.

(2) Teacher-centered problems. Teacher-centered problems were identified by more students than any other problem area. The predominant issue was the marginal level of classroom management exercised by the teachers. Most of the responses cited "poor discipline in the classroom" as being a major problem. Several children were critical of the students' lack of respect for authority. Two explained that teachers need to show children that they are tough, using procedures which children understand and respect. Teacher authority, which is accepted in most middle-class schools, is not highly valued by inner-city students. One respondent

felt that unless discipline is quite strict the entire school program is jeopardized.

Other respondents indicated that teachers often failed to distinguish between learning problems and discipline problems, treating all problems with the same medicine. In other words, the slow learner, or underachiever, is often punished for lack of success so that what began as a learning problem results in poor attitude toward school or learning.

Several respondents cited difficulties in the relationship between the teacher and student. Parents reported that teachers seem disorganized, that they don't grade students' work frequently enough, that they can't give enough attention to individual students, that they don't handle discipline problems correctly, and that they ask students to bring from home or buy supplies which the school should provide and which the students cannot afford. Parents reported frequently that teachers seemed little concerned as to whether the children would finish school.

Teachers reported such problems as different orientations between student and teacher due to race and social class, difficulties encountered in working with slow learners, and the teacher's ability to understand his own values and how these affected his work with the children. Certain teachers suggested that some teachers did not have the proper training or credentials to be certified to work in these schools.

Although the data collected did not permit a comparison of social class awareness and teaching effectiveness, several teachers indicated that since the students came from "such poor backgrounds" their poor performance record in school couldn't be changed no matter how hard the teacher worked.

Respondents also cited the dearth of effective techniques for motivating students of differential readiness and interests as a major problem. While all respondents indicated a need for better techniques to release the learning energies of both the achieving students and the underachievers, a majority admitted perplexity as to how to motivate children in the inner city. Two specifically mentioned detriments to better motivation were the preoccupation with the opposite sex among adolescents and the ease of dropping out. Several respondents said, "We should provide programs geared to the needs of potential dropouts; then they wouldn't drop out."

(3) Student-centered problems. This brings us to the sub-area we have chosen to call student-centered problems. Like each of the other sub-areas, the problems in this category are not simple. They reflect in varying degrees all phases of the school, home, and community environment.

Teachers at every grade level reported that many children come to them inadequately prepared in reading, speaking, and listening making it impossible for them to perform at that grade level. The teachers also reported that "the students have no interest in school" and "some of the students really like a lot of what goes on here but they can't read so they're judged failures by the system." In general teachers reported that even the good students do not feel much responsibility for school property, for their homework, or for their education. One parent suggested that if the school demonstrated more responsibility for students the children might feel differently about school. The data also suggested that the school as a formal institution is failing to meet the particular needs of its clients. "Students value what is sharp and what is cool--not education." Such statements indicate a need to rethink the role of the school and how best it should be organized to fulfill this role.

The Challenge of the Assessment Findings

Clearly the problems identified and the suggestions for alleviation obtained during the assessment phase of the Urban Education Developmental Project did not provide a ready-made formula for experimental intervention. That many and complex problems are perceived to exist was fully substantiated. That a creative means for dealing with these problems is necessary seemed clear. It now became incumbent upon the Project staff to invent a plan which would meet at least preliminary acceptance by the collaborating institutions.

Reporting to the Woodlawn Community Board

On June 7, 1967, the Director and Associate Directors of the Project made a preliminary report of the assessment findings to the Woodlawn Community Board. As can be surmised from the data just reviewed, this was not a pleasant public experience for the Chicago Public Schools contingent of the Woodlawn Community Board. Nevertheless, they demonstrated at that meeting, perhaps more than at any time previously, their desire to collaborate in school improvement. They listened to the problems presented and accepted a large measure of the criticism that the study had generated.

Mr. Melnick did ask for clarification about the number of respondents. He then said, "You have done a good job of identifying problem areas. What I worry about is the context and the way in which the questions were asked." He asked if self-fulfilling questions had been asked. Miss Wolfson replied that in her opinion both positive and negative questions were included and that the interview schedules were not "loaded." The Reverend Fish said, "A perception is a fact that we are interested in and a perception should be treated seriously and not as a deviancy from objective truth. The perceptions reported are fairly mild when compared to the perceptions of the T.W.O. Schools Committee. The world view of people must be treated as it is."

Mr. Peltz cited the need for a two-way flow between school and community. He said, "Historically the flow has not been two-way. The principal is in a key position but most of his communication is directed toward his superiors. It would be nice if the principal were left free to work with teachers in the classroom and parents in the community." Mr. Congreve said, "The experimental programs we design must take your dream into account." Mr. Peltz replied, "I can't quarrel with the data or the categories. We principals are sensitive because we are in the field, but the school has to be changed somehow."

Immediately following this meeting, three staff members departed for the East Coast to look into collaborative programs being developed in New York City (Bedford-Stuyvesant) and Washington, D. C. (Model School Division and the Adams-Morgan Project). These visits suggested that the programs were less than successful in part because the essential collaborations had not been securely formed and maintained. The community elements were weak in both the Bedford-Stuyvesant program and in the Model School Division in Washington. Furthermore, the Washington program had no college or university involved which was capable of wielding strong influence in both the public school system and the community. The Adams-Morgan Project was about to begin with a college (Antioch), community, and public school involvement, but the lines of authority and responsibility were not clearly drawn.

We also consulted briefly with Mr. Eliot Shapiro who was then director of an urban development project in Rochester, New York. Mr. Shapiro, too, emphasized the importance of community involvement. Thus, we were encouraged to think that our developmental effort had potential for at least two reasons: the essential collaborations representing the key institutions were working together and time was being taken to firmly establish the collaborative working relationship prior to the start of actual programs.

ALTERNATIVE DESIGNS FOR COLLABORATION TO IMPLEMENT SUBSTANTIVE PROGRAMS

Having answered by early June the first of the four major questions posed for the Project (What are the critical problems and educational needs as perceived by the people of the East Woodlawn community, professionals in the Chicago Public Schools, and members of the University of Chicago faculties?), the staff proceeded to confront the next two simultaneously. What new ideas can be generated, developed, and implemented in response to the assessment of problems and needs? What new ways of working together need to be established? While the assessment phase had made it quite clear that a readiness and willingness to work together did exist among the three institutions, the questions as to what experimental programs needed to be developed and what new structural relationships were required to implement these programs loomed large and perplexing.

One point of view holds that programs should be first conceived and then an administrative structure designed which will make the programs work. However, this situation did not lend itself readily to the direct application of such a view. To be sure, one of the goals of the Project was to design effective programs. The other was to devise new collaborative working relationships which would enable the institutions to contribute their unique resources to such programs. Nevertheless, the unique functioning of each institution at the outset of the Project immediately suggested restrictions upon programs that might be conceived. We felt sure that each institution might be required to advance its conception of operational procedures a bit, but institutions could not be expected to do this without a commitment to or a belief in the program to be pursued. Therefore, the Project staff, facing a sort of chicken and egg dilemma, not knowing how far each institution would stretch and thus not knowing how far to go in designing a program which would have the promise of being implemented, decided to deal with the questions of program and administrative structure simultaneously. The staff also decided that both short-term and long-term programs should be designed to permit preliminary testing of collaborative possibilities along the way.

In order to describe both efforts clearly, we will review the period from June 7 to December 31, 1967, twice. First, we will discuss the design and implementation of short-range projects. Second, we will review the development of the designs for the long-range efforts, those which have prepared the way for major experimental programs which hopefully will arise out of this Project. Both activities went on simultaneously and the results of the short-range efforts were constantly affecting the planning of the long-range program and administrative design.

Short-Range Designs

One might ask, inasmuch as the problems identified were many and complex, and the task of developing a program to deal with them collaboratively was formidable, why the Project staff members found themselves drawn into short-range projects. The answer to this question has important implications for the direction of the Project. During the assessment phase the respondents from all categories (school personnel, parents, and children) expressed great concern that this was just "another study" and nothing really would be done to help the school situation. Therefore, in order to offset this concern to some extent, the staff felt the need to design and implement interventions which could demonstrate the serious intentions to do something and at the same time serve as pilot tests of collaboration.

Three findings of the assessment phase led to the design of short-range, pilot-type interventions. In discussing problems of resources and personnel several teachers and parents noted that the after-school reading programs supported by Title I of Public Law 89-10 did not seem effective. They felt that the money allocated for this purpose might be better used in other ways.

To probe this problem further an open-ended questionnaire was designed by the Project staff and sent to all East Woodlawn teachers and principals. Four hundred seventy-one questionnaires were mailed; 160 were returned. Besides obtaining information on school assignment and whether or not the respondent was actually teaching in the after-school program, the questionnaire asked for a yes-no position followed by comments on three statements:

1. I think the after-school program should be continued as it is.

2. I think the after-school program should be continued but with some form of modification.

3. I think the after-school funds should somehow be reallocated into the classroom during the regular school day.

At the July 26, 1967, meeting of the Woodlawn Community Board, Miss LaVigne reported that the results received did not seem to indicate any clear-cut trends. However, the responses from two schools, Scott and Dumas, seemed to indicate that these faculties were willing to develop some modification of the program. Therefore, the Project staff recommended that as many teachers as were available from the two schools be invited to meet to discuss the possibility of reallocating the Title I funds. The results of the meetings held are reported in Appendix C. When confronted with an opportunity to influence reallocation of funds, both teacher groups decided to support continuation of the current program.

On September 27 the results of the meetings with the teachers were discussed by the Woodlawn Community Board. Reporting on the decision for no change, Mr. Congreve also indicated that the results had been turned over to the central administration of the public school system for further consideration. Thereupon, Mr. Melnick said that, even though school people decided in this instance not to reallocate Title I funds for the after-school program, the subject is still under question at various administrative levels. "We are attempting to get more freedom for teachers to make decisions regarding the allocation and expenditure of funds in the after-school program. I am cognizant of parental opinions concerning the program such as those which have been expressed by Mrs. Ida Davis of T.W.O. We are still trying to make adjustments because we, too, are not yet satisfied."

While some disappointment was expressed by the Project staff at the reluctance of teachers to change the status quo, it seemed clear that there were diverse opinions among each of the teacher groups; that teachers were not entirely ready to believe that they were really participating in so fundamental a decision; and that the fact that many teachers received compensation from the present after-school program was a factor in the deliberation and decisions. Nevertheless, the effort was significant in that it did demonstrate that the central administrative staff of the public school system was willing to allow local reconsideration of decisions which had been made previously almost entirely at the central office level.

The assessment phase also revealed a dire shortage of day-to-day substitutes in the East Woodlawn schools. When teachers were absent classes often had to be combined or special programs suspended, because no substitutes could be obtained. The staff thought that it might be possible to create an experimental substitute pool for East Woodlawn and thereby attract a number of people who would be willing to work in the East Woodlawn schools if they could be assigned to a limited number of schools and thereby sense some continuity in their work.

Therefore, a second short-range program was the development of an experimental substitute program for the East Woodlawn schools in District 14. The successful development of this collaborative program is described in Appendix D. At this writing some twenty-nine additional substitutes who previously would not have been certified by the Board of Examiners are at work in these schools. In addition, further plans are being made for recruiting and certifying additional individuals. We believe that by early spring of 1968 the day-to-day substitute problem in East Woodlawn will be essentially solved.

A third problem was revealed not so much from the assessment data but rather from the processes which the Project staff had to use in collecting the data. When interviewing children and teachers, conflicting data were often obtained. How the children viewed the situation often differed from how the teacher viewed it. "The eye of the beholder" being different resulted in different reports. What seemed to be needed was some device for enabling the viewer to see perspectives other than his own. One member of the Project staff became acquainted with a cinema verite team which had produced a film dealing with a local home for the aged. Upon seeing this completed film the Project staff was prompted to explore the possibilities of a pilot film in one of the East Woodlawn schools to determine if the filming techniques which proved successful in the home would also work in a school.

This cinematic social inquiry project in one East Woodlawn school became the third short-range effort. This project is reported in Appendix E. The additional funds necessary to make this pilot project possible were obtained from the Wieboldt Foundation. Two filmmakers, Gerald J. Temaner and Gordon Quinn, joined the Project staff in the late spring of 1967. During the next six months they conducted preliminary research to determine whether a cinema verite film could be made without distorting reality. This activity required the full cooperation of school personnel.

The study has been completed and a proposal has been developed for funds to support actual filming. This proposal is now being submitted to private and governmental agencies. Should the actual filming begin, the full support of public school and community persons will be crucial to ensure the necessary entree into school, homes, and other community settings. The envisioned film will, through the lives of individual children, focus on the existing relationships among the school, home, and community in the inner city.

Long-Range Designs

While the three short-range pilot projects were being carried forth, the main attention of the Project staff was directed toward the design of both a major experimental program and a means for sustaining the collaboration among the three institutions. In creating these designs, the staff became sensitive to another problem, that of communicating the various plans to enough members of each of the three institutions to make certain that support for the action of the Woodlawn Community Board would be forthcoming. This problem as stated may be bewildering in view of the existence of the Woodlawn Community Board. However, it should be remembered that the Woodlawn Community Board was an ad hoc group. Even though its members were appointed by executive officers of the three institutions, there was no clear mandate given any representative that would permit him to commit his institution by actions he took at Board meetings. Therefore, as the Project staff began to think about programs and structures which would require institutional commitments, it became clear to them that they would have to make sure that the deliberations included more people than just the members of the Woodlawn Community Board so that when action was finally taken by the Board each institution would be reasonably committed to supporting the decisions.

As a result, the T.W.O. representatives reported regularly to the T.W.O. Schools Committee, the T.W.O. delegates, and to the other executive members of T.W.O. The Dean of the Graduate School of Education appointed a cross-disciplinary University committee to advise the Project staff and to serve as a communicating agent. Copies of documents being discussed were also sent to the President and the Provost of the University to keep them apprised of developments. The General Superintendent of Schools convened members of his central staff to meet with the Project Directors to receive progress reports, offer advice, and indicate support. Mr. Melnick also arranged for the Project Directors to meet with all of the principals of the East Woodlawn schools to accomplish the same purposes.

In essence a three-level structure evolved for initiating ideas, receiving advice, and testing support for collaboration. The Project Director, Associate Directors, and other staff were responsible for the initial design, and reworking of designs. Each institution was then involved through its own groups to provide additional advice and develop support for the ideas within the institution. Finally, the Woodlawn Community Board representatives made recommendations and took other action when they felt they knew the degree of support that their instituion would give to the proposal being considered. In discussing the development of the major plans for collaboration and intervention, references will be made to these second echelon groups. Their function, as just explained, was vital to the success of this Project.

During the months of June and July, the Project staff struggled to try to find the key to answering the major questions about experimental program intervention and collaborative working relationships. As soon as the data from the assessment were assembled it became apparent that limited interventions similar to the compensatory programs would not work. What was needed was a major overhaul of the entire social system of the school and new administrative structural relationships which would insure the meaningful participation and collaboration of parents, community, and University personnel in the efforts of the schools.

The Project staff was urged on several occasions by both University and public school personnel to spell out in detail the program of intervention before becoming concerned with structure. However, having once determined that a major overhaul of the social system of the school was essential if success were to be realized, the staff found that prior to determining more specific program dimensions the implications for such an overhaul in terms of the organization and control of the schools needed to be made explicit. Therefore, major staff effort was directed toward developing an administrative plan that would permit this overhaul.

The first plan actually recorded on paper was completed on August 4. It is included as Appendix F. In essence the plan recognized as tenable hypotheses two findings of the Coleman study: (a) that schools bring little influence to bear on a child's achievement that is independent of his background and general social context; and (b) that among the attitudes which are highly related to educational achievement are those that reflect a sense of control over the environment, or a belief in the responsiveness of the environment.(3)

In order to provide Woodlawn people a sense of control over their school environment and thereby bring the school and the home into a more congruent relationship, the plan proposed the creation of a not-for-profit corporation called the Woodlawn Community Education Center. This Center would be controlled by a board consisting of a majority of community people but also containing representatives from the Chicago Public Schools and the University of Chicago. The Center would conduct necessary research to provide an analytic base for both the understanding and treatment of problems, and would initiate and coordinate action programs. The Woodlawn Community Education Center would thus maintain as a primary purpose the gradual and deliberate increase of community participation in the schools and the development of community control over the educational activities of the community, on behalf of the citizens of East Woodlawn.

Because of its uniqueness, the plan was sent immediately to the three co-chairmen of the Woodlawn Community Board and was brought before the University advisory committee on August 7. The reaction of the majority of University personnel indicated that support for such a plan would not be forthcoming. Some of the more specific concerns raised at that meeting were:

1. The plan would require great organizational and administrative changes including a local board of education, and no clear-cut plan had been developed for relating the Woodlawn Community Education Center to the existing school administration.

2. The Coleman report conclusions are at best hypotheses which need to be tested. We don't really know how influential community controlled schools can be. Furthermore, the term "control" is misleading: "None of us controls anything; we all operate in a complex world."

3. Such a plan would rule out funding under Title III of Public Law 89-10 which requires funds to go to an existing public school district.

4. The plan tends to deny that public education can be rehabilitated. Furthermore, it suggests that it is possible to gain a kind of community involvement in which everyone can participate. This is not possible even in the smallest communities.

5. The plan does not make any specific recommendations for changes to be brought about in the classrooms of the schools. The Project staff should do more thinking about program details.

Several counter arguments were offered in support of the paper by members of the Project staff and a minority of the University advisory committee. The general tenor remained one of non-support, but there was evidence that members of the committee were being influenced to consider seriously the role the community might play in improving the schools.

Private discussions which the Project Director had with Mr. Melnick revealed that he shared many of the concerns expressed by the University advisory committee, but that he too was willing to consider a plan which would make possible more community participation than had existed up to now.

Thus, the August 4 document was never brought before the Woodlawn Community Board. Influenced considerably by this rejection and the accompanying recommendation that the creative efforts be focussed more on program than on structure, the Project staff began to devise a clear-cut focus for programmatic intervention and a strategy to implement the focus. Nevertheless, the need for an effective administrative structure to maintain the collaboration kept returning to the minds of the staff.

They could not think program, intervention strategy, and resources without being confronted with the need to clarify relationships. Therefore, a document was prepared which summarized the Project staff's thinking about programmatic focus and developed logically a number of alternatives for administrative structure to be considered. The first draft of this document was completed on August 31. It was circulated to representatives of T.W.O., the Chicago Public Schools, and the University for comment and suggestions. A revised draft was then prepared for the Woodlawn Community Board meeting on September 27. This revision became the first major document to be discussed by the Woodlawn Community Board in the Urban Education Developmental Project.

The sections of this document significant to this report appear as Appendix G. The document contained five major sections: (a) a review of the assessment findings; (b) a summary of the philosophical and psychological basis for overhauling the social system of the school drawing upon the works of Whitehead, Dewey, Getzels, Rogers and Maslow; (c) a suggested strategy for bringing about the change needed which involved the acceptance of a focus and the adoption of a stream of schools (K-12) for experimental purposes; (d) a description of the focus for the experiment capsulated in the term "people helping people"; and (e) a discussion of four alternative administrative designs for collaborative action and eight criteria which the design selected must meet. This paper created a great deal of discussion in the Woodlawn Community Board and in the special advisory committees. The action taken by the Woodlawn Community Board reveals how confrontation increased the strength and effectiveness of the Board.

The discussion at the September 27 meeting of the Woodlawn Community Board centered on the question of the extent of the experimental program. The document had been circulated about a week before the Board meeting. Two days prior to the September 27 meeting, the Chicago Public Schools principals met to discuss the statement with Mr. Melnick, chairman for the Chicago Public Schools contingent. All East Woodlawn principals were present at this meeting as were Miss LaVigne and Mr. Congreve. That meeting focussed mainly on the four administrative plans, all of which were discussed thoroughly. All principals except one seemed to favor the tripartite collaborative plan. The opposing principal felt strongly that the Board of Education should retain complete control of the project and should not permit involvement (at least to the extent suggested in the proposal) of the local community and the University. Nevertheless, it was agreed that Mr. Melnick would vote for the tripartite collaborative plan when a vote was taken at the Woodlawn Community Board meeting.

The Woodlawn Community Board decided to examine each of the five sections of the document making such recommendations as it wished and taking such action as it deemed desirable. Sections I. and II. were accepted without question. In introducing Section III., Mr. Congreve reported the Project staff's recommendation for the acceptance of a focus strategy to be implemented in a stream of at least three schools (K-12). Mr. Campbell noted that this proposal was somewhat different from others suggested previously in that it recommended experimentation begin in a stream of schools rather than all of the East Woodlawn schools in District 14. When asked to give some background to this position, Mr. Congreve noted the complex matrix of interrelationships that would be involved in an experimental project which sought to reconstruct the social systems of the schools. A project encompassing all the East Woodlawn schools might involve unrealistic staff and financial needs. He stated, "If we can work with the total environment of a small number of schools, within a reasonable amount of time we should be able to accomplish specific objectives and then describe the cost for these changes." Mr. Congreve agreed that other approaches might be to work with a specific population of students in all of the East Woodlawn schools such as all the first-grade students, or to work on specific problems across the entire spectrum of the East Woodlawn schools. However, the Project staff believed that we should maximize impact in the total environment of a select number of schools involving about 200 teachers and 4,000 children.

Mr. Julian Levi pointed out two dilemmas we must avoid: an experiment with too small a population, or spreading ourselves too thin so as not to be able to make a difference in the schools and in the lives of the children. He indicated that to be successful the experimental project might require an annual expenditure per child of from $1,800 to $2,000. "If we can demonstrate success in the improvement of schools on the basis of reasonable scale, then we will have made a case to help every child in Woodlawn and elsewhere. We have to work with enough children to make our case but not with so many children that we diminish our effort." Mr. Campbell indicated that it may be possible to have efforts at two levels, including some programs for the total community area and some programs for selected students within that area. He also noted that the experimental project may have to begin modestly and then slowly expand.

However, a number of Board members, particularly representatives from the Chicago Public Schools and T.W.O., expressed concern over the concept of a stream of schools from kindergarten through grade twelve. It was generally felt that a stream of schools would mean that a number of schools and persons would not be able to participate in the program. Nevertheless, this first meeting on the document concluded with some apparent consensus on an experimental stream. Because much of the document still needed to be discussed, a special meeting was called for October 2.

Early in the meeting Mr. Congreve recalled that the discussion of the last meeting had centered on the issue of whether or not the experimental district should encompass all of the schools of East Woodlawn or just a stream of schools. While no action had been taken he sensed that a majority of Board members supported the stream of schools plan but also hoped for a broadening of the base of the program if at all feasible. Mr. Melnick said, "Is it possible to broaden the base of the project and include every student in East Woodlawn in some phase of the experimental program?" Mr. Campbell suggested that the project have two levels: an intensive effort with a stream of schools and a less intensive effort with other schools. He offered as an example programs of in-service education which might involve teachers from all the East Woodlawn schools. He also pointed out that successful activities in the stream of schools must be shared with other schools in East Woodlawn continually during the life of the project.

Discussion ranged around Mr. Melnick's question for almost an hour until it seemed time to bring the issue to a head. Because the schools in which they worked were the subject of a discussion, it is not surprising that the public school delegation was uneasy during this time.

Mr. Campbell asked if the Board could reach some consensus regarding focus for the experimental project. He asked if the Board wished to vote in a general body or after group caucus. Mr. Perlin said that he preferred a straight vote by the general body. Mr. Campbell reminded the Board that the caucus had been provided by the agreement establishing the Board. Mr. Melnick said that there seemed to be some consensus on the stream but there still is a feeling that some of the programs must be broadened when feasible. The Reverend Brazier moved and Mrs. Ida Davis seconded that the experimental project be focussed on a stream of schools and that the experiment be large enough to have validity and small enough to be controllable. Mr. Campbell called for discussion on the motion. Mr. Silber said that some principals are having to face the possibility that they would not be involved in the major thrust of the project. Dr. Melnick said that perhaps it would be necessary to amend the language of the motion to clarify the question of broader programs. He recognized that perhaps all schools could not be involved at first but that perhaps all of the schools could eventually be involved. Mr. Melnick said that he could vote "yes" on the motion if it included this sense of direction. Mr. Silber said that his concern had not been answered. "Are we talking about three schools . . . or not?"

The Reverend Brazier said that Board members should not leave the meeting thinking that all schools are involved when we are not really sure that that will be the case. He said that if we cannot know how many schools are going to be involved perhaps we should move on to the question of administrative plans and return to this issue. Mr. Yakir W. Korey, principal in the Chicago Public Schools, said that the Board needed to discuss the four alternative administrative plans before deciding on the number of schools to be involved in the project. Mr. Campbell expressed disagreement with such a move. Mr. Congreve noted that in his opinion the demands of the experiment require a decision on the number of schools. Mr. Korey disagreed with Mr. Congreve. Thereupon, the Reverend Brazier requested a caucus and Mr. Campbell temporarily adjourned the meeting for that purpose at 6:15 p.m.

While the original agreement that established the Woodlawn Community Board had made provision for caucus, this was the first time in the history of the Board that a caucus had been required. It was clear that the Reverend Brazier made his request to give the Chicago Public Schools delegation an opportunity to convene privately.

The Board reconvened at 6:35 p.m. Mr. Campbell called on Mr. Melnick for a report on the deliberations of the Chicago Public Schools representatives. Mr. Melnick said, "We can accept the limitation of three schools in an experimental stream but in addition we would like to see a reading readiness program at the preschool or kindergarten level for all of the schools in East Woodlawn." Mr. Campbell asked Mr. Melnick if he wished to be that specific. Mr. Melnick said, "Yes, unless the Project staff has other alternatives to suggest." The Reverend Brazier withdrew his motion to allow Mr. Melnick to make a new motion. Mr. Melnick then moved that the experimental project be focussed on a stream of three to four schools ranging from kindergarten to grade twelve with the additional provision for specific programming (possibly reading readiness) which could apply to all the schools in East Woodlawn. Mr. Congreve asked Mr. Melnick if he were thinking about a Head Start program. Mr. Melnick said that the most important thing for kids to be able to do is to read and that such a program could do more more to improve the quality of education in the schools of East Woodlawn than any other single intervention.

Mr. Silber said that, while the project may build up the morale and community spirit in the stream of schools, these factors will be diminished in the other schools. Mr. William E. Henry of the University suggested that perhaps the problem should be approached specifically from Mr. Silber's point of view; in other words, what can be done to maintain morale throughout the community? Mr. Campbell remarked that the real problem that the Board is dealing with is the morale of teachers and principals. Mr. Silber said, "Even if it is only scraps, the other schools need something."

Mr. McPherson amended Mr. Melnick's motion to read, "The experimental project should be focussed in a stream of three to four schools in the East Woodlawn neighborhood of District 14, ranging at a minimum from grades K-12. In addition, some monies will be specifically allocated to each of the additional schools in the East Woodlawn neighborhood of District 14, the amount of such monies to be determined so as not to diminish the budget resources necessary for a maximized effort in the experimental stream of schools. Individual school staffs will determine the nature of expenditure of those specifically allocated funds. An individual school may decide to expend those monies unilaterally, in concert with other schools, or in collaboration with the experimental project." This motion was carried unanimously in a general vote by the entire Board.

After the extensive deliberations about the structure of the experimental district, the Woodlawn Community Board was invited to turn its attention to the four alternative administrative structures recommended by the Project staff. One plan would turn over the experimental schools to a community board. Another plan would have the Chicago Board of Education contract with the University of Chicago for the administration and operation of these schools. A third design would place the entire burden of experiment and change on the Chicago Board of Education. A fourth plan would retain the tripartite collaborative arrangement established through the Woodlawn Community Board but would require the development of a Memorandum of Agreement among the three institutions which would define the specific roles, responsibilities, limits of authority, and working relationships.

The Project staff recommended the tripartite collaborative administrative plan inasmuch as the other three plans would either limit full three-way collaboration or might be impossible to implement immediately because of legal restrictions. Two principals then moved and seconded that the tripartite collaborative plan be accepted in principle with the details to be worked out by the three chairmen of the Woodlawn Community Board. The motion was passed with one dissenting vote, that of the school principal who had consistently objected to any plan which did not place complete administrative responsibility and control of the project in the hands of the General Superintendent of Schools and the Chicago Board of Education.

At the close of the October 2 meeting, it appeared that the major administrative arrangements for the experimental project were agreed upon and the Project staff was now free to move ahead in working out a detailed proposal for intervention in the experimental schools and to settle some minor administrative questions.

But neither the life of the Project staff nor of the Woodlawn Community Board turned out to be that simple. In the next month the staff and Board were to learn that the administrative arrangements for the experimental project had not yet been clearly settled, that considerable time would be required to write and rewrite an acceptable Memorandum of Agreement, and that the development of a proposal for intervention that was consistent with the findings of the assessment and at the same time acceptable to the three collaborating institutions would require considerable work and negotiation.

In order that these three interlocking threads can be reported briefly and accurately, it is necessary to separate them in our narrative. Therefore, we will discuss what happened subsequent to the October 2 meeting following the threads. First, we will focus on refinements of the experimental plan. Then, we will discuss the development of the proposal for intervention. Finally, we will focus on the development and acceptance of the Memorandum of Agreement which provided the basis for sustained collaboration beyond the life of the Project.

Refining the Experimental Plan

When the Woodlawn Community Board convened on November 8 expecting to begin discussion on the program statement, Mr. Melnick announced that all of the East Woodlawn principals were planning to meet on Friday, November 10, to discuss questions related to the experimental district. Mr. Melnick asked that a special meeting of the Board be scheduled for the following Tuesday. Thus, while a discussion of program elements continued, it was clear that the Chicago Public Schools delegation was not completely satisfied with the plan of the experimental district.

On November 14 the Chicago Public Schools representatives were ready to discuss a substitute motion for the motion which had been passed by the Board on October 2. Mr. Perlin presented the motion:

> Be it moved that all schools in East Woodlawn be declared members of the experimental district, but that the major interventions attempted will take place in a stream of three to four schools; that in developing the intervention design and in establishing controls ideas will be sought from school and community personnel and advice obtained from specialists in design; and that the director of the experimental district will bring to the Woodlawn Community Board for approval the design or designs to be used which he feels are appropriate to the various areas that will be developed in the experimental program.

Mr. Congreve suggested that having all of the schools as members of the experimental district would facilitate the establishing of appropriate controls within a research and evaluation design. Mr. Peltz suggested that perhaps the substitute motion ought to read, "in a stream of no less than three to four schools." The Reverend Brazier said that we may be wise to use the "no less than" phrase given the evidence regarding mobility within Woodlawn. Mr. Perlin offered as an alternative to the Peltz amendment the suggestion that the motion read, "in a stream of one or more schools." Dr. Melnick expressed preference for the Peltz amendment. Mr. Julian Levi said that under the best of circumstances we may have a job convincing the Board of Education (or its counsel) of the urgency of the experimental program. He argued that, if we say that all schools in East Woodlawn are members of the experimental district and we are talking about ten schools and some 12,000 students, we may be asking the Board of Education to give up a great deal. If the Board were to utilize the Perlin amendment we might sound ambitious but also realistic. Mr. Melnick countered that we need three schools to achieve a K-12 stream. He felt that we can persuade the Board of Education to establish the experimental district if we are in essence not asking for more money from the Board of Education but rather the freedom to spend additional money that the Woodlawn Community Board will obtain from outside sources.

Mr. D. Gale Johnson of the University pointed out that in his opinion one or more implies that the Board will eventually get to all of the schools while three or four is more realistic. Mr. Melnick said that for design purposes we really must have three schools to achieve a K-12 stream. The Reverend Brazier said that he felt the Board would be moving backward to support the "one or more" amendment. He said, "We need three to four schools to get a real experimental district and even that is restrictive but we will live with that."

It was then determined that each amendment should be voted upon consecutively. The amendment first advanced by Mr. Peltz was accepted by a vote of 13 to 3. The amendment first proposed by Mr. Perlin was defeated by a vote of 14 to 4. Mr. Korey asked for a vote on the motion without amendment but his request was declared out of order. Mr. Melnick asked for a vote on the amended motion. It was carried by a vote of 14 to 3.

Creating the Proposal for Experimental Intervention

Following the October 2 meeting the Project staff set to work developing in some detail an experimental intervention program for the stream of schools which had been outlined briefly in the September 27 document. Prior to bringing the statement to the Woodlawn Community Board the staff presented its plans to the University advisory committee for comments, criticisms, and suggestions. While the University committee supported the process approach developed by the Project staff to overhaul the social system, it strongly urged the inclusion of a more definite commitment to curriculum revision directed toward improving student achievement. In response to this recommendation, specific achievement objectives were formulated. In addition, procedures were suggested which would enable teachers to assess the suitability of curriculum content while they were designing other techniques to increase learning.

By the end of October the Project staff had developed a program statement in sufficient detail to be brought before the Woodlawn Community Board for its reaction, criticism, and suggestions for revision. This statement was gone over section by section and revised by the Woodlawn Community Board at the November 8 and November 15 meetings. Between meetings the Project Director held conferences with individual members of the Board, especially the Woodlawn principals. A summary of the statement finally adopted on November 15 and which has now been used for the development of proposals for funding appears as Appendix H.

SUSTAINING THE WOODLAWN COMMUNITY BOARD

Preparing the Memorandum of Agreement

At the October 2 meeting of the Woodlawn Community Board the Project staff was commissioned to proceed with the development of a program statement and to work out other necessary details so that the chairmen could begin necessary negotiations with the governing boards of the three collaborating institutions. This action was interpreted by the Project staff and the three chairmen to mean that they would develop a Memorandum of Agreement and carry out the negotiations necessary to gain acceptance by the government board of the University of Chicago, T.W.O., and the Chicago Public Schools. The Board did not instruct the chairmen or the Project Director to make progress reports nor did it request that the Memorandum as finally developed be accepted by the Woodlawn Community Board. Therefore, the entire process was consummated without further reference to the Board. It can be argued, therefore, that the staff and the three chairmen thus acted in accordance with the instructions of the Board. However, as we will point out below, this procedure created some anxieties among the Board members.

Even before the Woodlawn Community Board took action on the tripartite collaborative plan the members of the Project staff began to consider the degrees of autonomy which they felt would be essential if an experiment such as we were envisioning were to be undertaken in the East Woodlawn schools. The initial draft of such provisions is of considerable interest historically and also is useful forcomparative purposes. It was entitled Parameters of Autonomy for the Experimental Sub-District and appears as Appendix I. It reveals the initial underlying concerns which the staff members had about the current ability of the Chicago Public Schools system to accommodate an experimental program of the magnitude and intensity as was being proposed.

As one reviews this document, he cannot help but be struck by its repeated insistence upon autonomy for the experimental sub-district. Even the title refers to autonomy, not to collaboration. The words "freedom to," "full control over," and "assurance that" appear repeatedly. It is somewhat amusing now and also quite revealing that even though the Project staff had recommended the tripartite collaborative administrative plan, this first Memorandum of Agreement document really sets forth a plan whereby the Woodlawn Community Board would become the local school board and would obtain full control over the experimental sub-district. Why did this happen? As one reviews the discussion at the Project staff meetings, it is apparent that the staff believed that restrictions (real and imagined) of the bureaucratic school system could not be bent or lifted sufficiently to make possible any kind of an experiment.

This initial statement never got beyond the staff group. A review by Dean Campbell and by Superintendent Melnick revealed that many of the freedoms requested already existed as options for the principals of the schools. Furthermore, some of the freedoms requested might not be necessary. It also became apparent that the tone of the document might raise the defenses of public school people. Such a reaction might inhibit or even halt the effort to find a means of collaboration.

As a result, a second document was prepared which began with a preamble setting forth the spirit of collaboration and then stipulated a limited number of provisions for autonomy which seemed essential to make the experiment possible. The emphasis in the document was on the experiment, and the freedoms to be agreed upon were to be consistent with the needs inherent in the experiment. It was this document entitled Memorandum of Agreement and dated October 3, 1967, which appears as Appendix J with which the three chairmen of the Woodlawn Community Board began to work.

The three chairmen convened a meeting on October 18 to consider the October 3 paper and also to discuss the directions of the Project. The Project Director did not attend this meeting at his request, inasmuch as one of the items on the agenda was to talk about who might be named director of the experimental district if such a development should become a reality. Interestingly, these men did not sit down and work out a new draft of the document. Instead they reported back to the Project Director that the presentation and language seemed a bit overbearing and that the demands still seemed somewhat greater than necessary. They requested the Director to attempt revisions and to consult individually with each chairman to obtain reactions, specific suggestions, and approval.

The Project Director accepted the instructions of the three chairmen and between October 19 and November 3 reworked and revised the document several times, checking it with each co-chairman. The November 3 Memorandum which appears as Appendix K was the first version presented to the Chicago Board of Education on December 13. However, prior to that meeting of the Chicago Board of Education, the Project Director established a contact with the General Superintendent of Schools which proved to be of great value.

Up until this time, the activities of the Project staff had been reviewed but once by the General Superintendent of Schools and his central staff. This review came immediately following the assessment efforts late in June. Several overtures were made to the General Superintendent during September and October to arrange a second meeting. However, these requests were not couched in urgency terms and were therefore placed in competition with the many other demands for the General Superintendent's time and attention during the opening of a school term at a time when both budget planning and negotiations of teacher contracts became urgent matters for him. In addition, the General Superintendent had recently appointed the Superintendent of District 14 to the position of Area Associate Superintendent and had delegated to him considerable additional authority and responsibility for the Project. However, as we were to discover later, when the critical decisions concerning the Project were about to be made by the Board of Education, complete knowledge about the Project and support of it on the part of the General Superintendent was essential. Because the course of history so often depends on the circumstance, fortuitous or otherwise, it is important to note in some detail the next two developments.

On November 3 the General Superintendent of Schools and the Project Director met at an informal gathering. Prior to this evening, the Project Director was of the mind that all was proceeding well and that the fact that no conference about the state of progress of the Project had been held with the General Superintendent of Schools was not serious. During the conversation it became apparent that Dr. Redmond was not fully informed and felt an urgent need to be so informed. It also became apparent to Mr. Congreve that more intensive involvement of the General Superintendent was imperative if we were to get the program before the Board of Education in the near future. This new awareness was not interpreted by either the Project Director or the General Superintendent as a criticism of each other, but rather as a new found urgency to be satisfied. Mr. Congreve agreed to get copies of the Memorandum of Agreement and a preliminary draft of the proposal which now appears as Appendix H to Dr. Redmond early the following week and to do everything possible to arrange a meeting to discuss these documents.

A second stroke of good fortune occurred the following Tuesday, November 7. Having decided to deliver the documents to the General Superintendent's office to expedite matters, the Project Director found him available to go over the critical aspects of them at that time. At the close of this one-hour conference Dr. Redmond indicated that he did not feel that the Chicago Board of Education would adopt the Memorandum of Agreement as it stood but he reaffirmed his support of the Project and indicated he believed in the proposals for collaboration and would work with us to find a way to make these a reality.

Reassured by this support and comforted with the knowledge that the General Superintendent of Schools was now adequately informed about the Project and would take the initiative to bring the administrative plan before his central staff and subsequently to the Board of Education, the Director returned to the task of obtaining support from the Woodlawn Community Board for the statement of proposed experimental intervention in order that specific proposals (such as the one for a grant under Title III of Public Law 89-10) could be prepared.

Strengthening the Spirit of Collaboration

Even though the members of the Woodlawn Community Board had been fully involved in discussing and revising the statement, even though additional meetings had been held with the public school contingent of the Woodlawn Community Board, and even though the Board adopted the statement on November 14, all was not peaceful. We had been required to move fast and several people were uncomfortable, especially the principals of the two schools where the experimentation was to begin. Furthermore, the Memorandum of Agreement had been prepared and accepted by the three chairmen, discussed with the General Superintendent, but never presented to the Board. Therefore, on December 6 the Project Director, in his report to the Woodlawn Community Board, stated these concerns. Among other things he said:

> The Project staff and the related institutions have had to move extremely fast these past few months . . . . Hopefully our main target has been the children and will remain the children.
>
> Perhaps we've moved too fast . . . . Nevertheless, program thrust and administrative design are not the works of any one person. They developed out of conflict, discussion, and creative resolution. The ideas came from many sources: principals, teachers, children, parents, University faculty, members of the Woodlawn Community Board, and of course the Project staff. . . . We do recognize that these sources and contacts were limited both in time and the number of people involved. Nevertheless, it is my conviction that the document which you accepted at our last meeting developed out of collaboration. . . .
>
> Our commitment is to a collaborative program. The tripartite administrative plan and the focus of the proposal which the Woodlawn Community Board approved require involvement of principals, parents, teachers, children, and University personnel. They do not, however, as some people seem to fear, turn the schools over to the University or to the community. They simply require a new form of involvement, a new use of resources. . . .
>
> I think we have one of the most exciting opportunities ever made available to educators and parents for helping children. I hope we can keep our forum open and improve on our collaboration. As one principal said to me the other day, "Let's not drop this ball."

This statement seemed to help clear the air. However, in retrospect, greater involvement of the Board in the deliberations about the Memorandum of Agreement may have reduced considerably the tensions which had built up. Even though the Board members had instructed the three chairmen and staff to create and negotiate a Memorandum of Agreement, they were uncomfortable that they had not been consulted along the way. The Board was still too young to have developed the mutual trust necessary to control these anxieties.

Negotiating the Memorandum of Agreement

Between November 14 and 28, Dr. Redmond asked members of his central office staff to study the proposed Memorandum of Agreement and proposal statement. On November 28 it was agreed in the office of Associate Superintendent Evelyn F. Carlson that the Memorandum of Agreement would be presented to the Chicago Board of Education on December 13, and a Title III (Public Law 89-10) proposal for an operation grant would be prepared and submitted on December 27. Board report #67-1214 was prepared for the December 13 meeting and it would, upon adoption, create the Woodlawn Experimental District to be operated and administered under the provisions of the Memorandum of Agreement. A copy of this report appears as Appendix K.

On December 13, upon the advice of the attorney for the Chicago Board of Education, Mr. James W. Coffey, the Chicago Board of Education deferred the report and requested that the Memorandum of Agreement be rewritten so that it would be legally acceptable under the provisions of the Illinois School Code. At that meeting, General Superintendent Redmond made a strong plea for the program and asked publicly that the Board of Education legal office help the schools to find new ways of working on the perplexing problems of inner-city schools.

This action on the part of the Board of Education created a situation of extreme urgency. If experimentation were to begin in the East Woodlawn schools during 1967, a major Title III proposal had to be submitted before the January 15, 1968, deadline. In order to meet this deadline, the proposal had to be approved for submission by the Chicago Board of Education on December 27. Furthermore, all materials for the December 27 meeting had to be mailed to Board of Education members on December 22. Yet, the Title III proposal could not be completed until the experimental district was created and the Memorandum of Agreement adopted. There was no other course to choose but to move ahead with the proposal while the negotiations were continuing on the Agreement, with full recognition that all might be for naught and also recognizing that on the final day considerable maneuvering might be required.

On Thursday, December 14, Mr. Melnick and Mr. Congreve met in the offices of Mr. Coffey to revise the Memorandum of Agreement so that it would be within the laws of the State of Illinois. Present along with Mr. Coffey was Mr. Joseph Murphy, another attorney for the Chicago Board of Education. At this meeting, it was made quite clear that the School Code as interpreted by the Board of Education attorney would not permit the Board of Education to enter into any arrangement which tied the hands of the General Superintendent of Schools or the Chicago Board of Education. Therefore, any phrases which permitted decisions to be made by the experimental district or which called for joint decisions by the experimental district and the Chicago Board of Education were ruled out. Thus, the entire document was recouched in terms which kept ultimate authority with the Board of Education (see Appendix L).

This action by the attorneys was initially viewed as a serious step backwards. In a sense it voided the Woodlawn Community Board and also raised the question as to whether there even should have been such a body during the feasibility study. It will be recalled that at no time up to this moment was any attempt made to legitimize the Woodlawn Community Board by asking that it be either recognized or sanctioned by the Chicago Board of Education. It is also of interest to note that in the November 3 version of the Memorandum of Agreement the Woodlawn Community Board was not explicitly defined and was only involved to the extent that it would recommend the director of the experimental district and would be consulted regarding the designation of the schools to be included in the experimental stream. In many places, the words "experimental district" were used where "Woodlawn Community Board" could have been used.

The minimum role provided for the Woodlawn Community Board in this early document reveals the ambivalence which surely was in the minds of the Project staff about the role of the Board. The Board was still being viewed as a temporary mechanism with the potential of becoming a viable continuing body, but with no full commitment to push hard towards this end.

Nevertheless, the revision completed on Thursday which was to be rejected by T.W.O. proved to be significant. It substituted the words "the director of the Experimental District" for the words "experimental district" and thereby established a line relationship between a man responsible for administering the experimental district and the General Superintendent of Schools. As we shall see below, this move, which clarified one ambivalence, pointed up the real issue and thus became the handle which turned the mental processes and led to the ultimate agreement.

At the close of this conference, Mr. Coffey agreed to provide Mr. Melnick and Mr. Congreve with clean copies to be cleared with Mr. Campbell and the Reverend Brazier. Mr. Congreve commented as the meeting closed, "I don't think the Reverend Brazier will buy this revision." Comments from the other members present were in effect: "He will have to if we are going to have an experiment. The law will not permit us to do anything else, so the best we can do is to proceed in good faith that the director will involve the community and the collaboration will continue."

On Friday, the clean copies of the revised document were received and accepted by Mr. Campbell without change. On Saturday, the Project Director brought the revised document to the Reverend Brazier. He rejected it summarily on the grounds that it did not guarantee that the director of the experimental district would deal with the Woodlawn Community Board. Here, for the first time in the negotiation process, the relationship between the director of the experimental district and the Woodlawn Community Board was openly designated as a critical element in the tripartite collaborative plan. It had been included as an element up to this point, but when the Reverend Brazier identified the Woodlawn Community Board as that body with which the director of the experimental district must deal, another ambivalence in the agreement was clarified. Further, the Reverend Brazier argued that unless the director is required to deal with the Board the director can become a puppet of the public school administration or can avoid dealing with the Board on controversial issues. During this meeting the Reverend Brazier suggested how the document might be revised to legitimate the Woodlawn Community Board and insure its involvement in the experimental project. Two phrases explain the Reverend Brazier's position at that time: "the director of the experimental district brings all matters to the Woodlawn Community Board to obtain its concurrence" and "the General Superintendent and Board of Education act only after such concurrence has been obtained."

On Sunday the Project Director prepared another version of the Memorandum of Agreement which reflected the Reverend Brazier's position (see Appendix M). On Monday the Project Director reviewed his latest version with Mr. Melnick who expressed the opinion that the Board of Education attorney would not accept it because it bound the hands of the General Superintendent and the Chicago Board of Education by requiring concurrence of the Woodlawn Community Board in all its actions. Therefore, he was reluctant to bring such a document to the attorney but did agree to permit the project Director to do so. In fact, he arranged an appointment for the Project Director with Mr. Coffey for 4:00 p.m. that afternoon. During the day Mr. Congreve cleared the new version with the Reverend Brazier who gave his full support to the document.

At 4:00 p.m. Mr. Congreve met with Mr. Coffey and Mr. Murphy. They rejected this version as Mr. Melnick had predicted. The Project Director then suggested that the only way an acceptable Memorandum might be created was to bring Mr. Coffey and the Reverend Brazier together and see if the differences could be resolved. During this meeting Mr. Congreve contacted the Reverend Brazier by telephone and succeeded in having the Reverend Brazier and Mr. Coffey discuss the matter over the telephone. Mr. Coffey was persistent in his interpretation of the law, but indicated a willingness to meet with the Reverend Brazier and any legal counsel he wished to bring along.

By this time it became apparent to the Project Director that (a) Mr. Melnick was willing to agree to any plan acceptable to T.W.O. and the University that would be within the interpretation of the law as held by the Chicago Board of Education attorney; (b) a deadlock existed over the matter of authority with regard to the experimental district; (c) no further action would be taken by any parties unless someone assumed the role of keeping the negotiations alive; and (d) the deadline of Friday, December 22, was fast approaching. Feeling an urgency to obtain expert legal counsel, Mr. Congreve called Mr. Julian Levi, Executive Director of the South East Chicago Commission, lawyer, and member of the Woodlawn Community Board, at his home on Monday evening. Upon hearing a report about the state of affairs, Mr. Levi invited Mr. Congreve to come to his home and thereupon spent the entire evening studying several documents including the Illinois School Code and preparing arguments for a more liberal position to present to the Board of Education attorney for his consideration. During this same evening, telephone discussions were held with the Reverend Brazier who willingly permitted an interruption into a meeting of T.W.O. delegates which he was chairing. It was agreed that, if possible, Mr. Levi, the Reverend Brazier, and Mr. Congreve would meet with Mr. Coffey for luncheon on Tuesday.

On Tuesday the Project Director was successful in arranging a two-hour period for a luncheon meeting. The luncheon provided the opportunity for Mr. Coffey and Mr. Levi to become acquainted as professional colleagues. Upon returning to the office, Mr. Coffey reiterated his interpretation of the law, and Mr Levi offered precedents for some flexibility. The Reverend Brazier finally remarked. "I don't feel the Woodlawn Community Board should have final authority and responsibility for running the schools; certainly T.W.O. doesn't want this. Therefore, I agree that the hands of the General Superintendent and the Board of

Education must remain unfettered, but isn't there some way to make sure that the director of the experimental district must deal with the Woodlawn Community Board prior to bringing matters to the General Superintendent or to the Board of Education? Is there anything illegal about requiring this director to bring matters to the Woodlawn Community Board and seek its concurrence and then report the actions of the Board along with his recommendations to the General Superintendent?"

Mr. Coffey declared that as long as the authority for final decision remained with the Board of Education there would be no problem.

Thus, agreement was essentially reached. The role of the director of the experimental district was defined and the Woodlawn Community Board was to become a viable and essential part of the Woodlawn Experimental District. All that remained were minor clearances with the University administration, Mr. Melnick, and General Superintendent Redmond. These were obtained easily. Wednesday and Thursday were taken up with writing and rewriting versions to make sure the essence of the agreement was captured in the final version. The Project staff also worked feverishly to complete the Title III (Public Law 89-10) proposal. On Friday, December 22, a meeting was held at 8:30 a.m. to make sure that all parties were in agreement. The meeting was attended by Mr. Melnick who represented District 14 and, as Area Associate Superintendent, also represented the General Superintendent; Mr. Congreve, Project Director who represented Mr. Campbell of the University; the Reverend Brazier, President of T.W.O.; Mr. Julian Levi, attorney, representing T.W.O. and the University; and Mr. Coffey and Mr. Murphy, Board of Education attorneys. A few minor changes in wording were agreed to; of especial significance was the insertion of the words in paragraph four which require the director of the experimental district to report actions of the Woodlawn Community Board and to indicate its nonconcurrence when applicable. A copy of the document was finally accepted to be presented to the Board of Education on December 27 (see Appendix N).

It should be pointed out that reaching this agreement by the parties involved on December 22 in no way ensured adoption of the Memorandum by the Board of Education on December 27. However, we were assured that the document had the full support of the school administration, the University, and T.W.O. and that it was drawn to be consistent with the provisions of the Illinois School Code. Therefore, the members of the Board of Education could not decline to act because of a weakness in the procedures used to draft the document, but had to accept or reject it on its merit as interpreted by each Board member.

Dean Campbell agreed to be present at the Board of Education meeting to make such explanations as might be required. Mr. Campbell's presence proved to be critical. Just prior to the December 27 meeting the south side of Chicago experienced several instances of crime, including shootings, which were attributed to gang activity. Inasmuch as T.W.O. had established an affiliation with the gangs through their own youth program, concern was expressed by members of the Board of Education as to the appropriateness of its entering into an arrangement with T.W.O. Both

Mr. Campbell and General Superintendent Redmond defended this involvement at the meeting. The Memorandum of Agreement was adopted by a vote of 8 to 3.

✓

SUMMATION

This feasibility study has created the first experimental district in the Chicago Public Schools in which a university, a strong community organization, and the city public schools have agreed to participate in a collaborative search for an educational program of high quality for inner-city children.

From the outset this study was searching for means of collaboration. It began by recognizing and respecting the unique nature and interests of each institution. It accepted the possibility that these unique interests might generate disagreements. In the beginning we were quite concerned about this conflict. But as time went on we found that out of difference new ideas were formulated and new relationships established. We learned that we gained strength as we accepted debate as both rational and inevitable, as we found that creative resolution of difference increased the confidence among the partners. However, such resolution did not always decrease tension. Instead the new levels of interaction often suggested further needs which again generated discussion. Each time the conflict was faced squarely, we progressed. When we attempted to avoid disagreement we lost ground.

We also learned that producing institutional change to enable collaborative relationships requires leadership in each institution. This is particularly difficult for large institutions with standardized procedures and practices. In this situation, the institution which faced the greatest difficulty in entering into a collaborative relationship was the Chicago Public Schools. Yet, through the concerted efforts of a committed General Superintendent of Schools and a forward looking District Superintendent, the Chicago Public Schools system was able to accept new partners and to become an active party in the creative resolution of conflict.

It appears that the Urban Education Developmental Project has found a possible structure for local reform in urban education. While we have yet to test this structure in an actual experimental-demonstration project, we advance the hypothesis that local reform requires the combined action of (a) the school system, (b) a community organization, and (c) a university. Where a strong community organization like T.W.O. does not exist, we doubt if the wisdom and integrity of the professionals alone will do the job. We come to this conclusion not only from the experience of our study, but also from examining several local reform efforts which have attempted to go forward without strong relationships with a community organization (Roxbury in Boston, Adams-Morgan in Washington, D. C., and the New York University Bedford-Stuyvesant Project). Further, we would hypothesize that where a community organization does not exist one of the first things that a school system and/or a university interested in local educational reform should try to do is to help create such an organization with the full knowledge that it will eventually create conflict with the very institutions which helped it come into existence.

In order to make this tripartite structure functional, we feel that some sort of board such as the Woodlawn Community Board is essential. In fact, we advocate the structuring and operating procedures of our Board as exemplary. From the very beginning it was agreed that decisions by the Board must have the concurrent approval of all three institutions in order that two institutions could not out-vote the third one. In addition, each institutional group could caucus before casting its vote, if it so desired.

We found that there was great wisdom in this procedure. It forced people to try to talk things through, to reach a consensus and avoid the embarrassment of a split vote. As the Board matured, the procedures established initially were clarified. Nevertheless, the basic plan for organization and operation has not changed. An up-to-date description of procedures was prepared on December 27, 1967, as a companion document to the Memorandum of Agreement. It appears as Appendix O. When compared with Appendix A, this document reveals how little the procedures of the Board changed during the feasibility study.

There is little doubt in our minds that when such a board is created it must be asked almost immediately to grapple with live issues. There is a risk in having the board confronted with tough issues early in its life, but without issues the board members cannot create mechanisms necessary to convert disagreement into collaborative relationships. In retrospect, we view as most fortunate the early issues which the Woodlawn Community Board was required to confront even before the Urban Education Developmental Project could be launched.

We also learned that in a tripartite collaborative arrangement such as this, one of the partners often has to serve as moderator and that a university can often do this. The public school system controls the schools and resources; the community organization has the sense of the people and the power to speak for its constituents. Everyone has good ideas, but it seems that some party has to help bring these together. University personnel often can be more objective and, acting as a kind of junior partner, can help to broaden the perspectives of the other participating institutions.

Our experience leads us to believe that elements in addition to the tripartite involvement of a university, community organization, and a public school system can facilitate a collaborative venture. For example, we think it significant that from the outset the focus of attention for this Project has been on a part of one district in Chicago. We doubt if we could have proceeded as well if we had begun by dealing with the entire Chicago Public Schools system or even at the central office level. In one sense we ended up testing both collaboration and decentralization.

But even within these restricted parameters we found it quite difficult to establish and maintain communication with everyone who should be involved. Members of the Woodlawn Community Board itself often needed more time to criticize and discuss proposals than was possible. Although the Board served its function reasonably well, it had to be supplemented by additional committees created by each institution. Teachers were essentially uninvolved. As we proceed into the experimental phase, we must find ways to broaden and deepen the participation of all people who will be critical to the success of the programs.

When we got down to hard negotiations on the Memorandum of Agreement we also learned that universities and community organizations do not want to run public schools; yet they do want a voice in their operation. We believe that this finding is a most important one. From it we would hypothesize that the cries for community control now being sounded in several cities could be responded to if structures such as the Woodlawn Experimental District and Woodlawn Community Board could be created to ensure the participation of community people in making decisions about the schools.

There is little evidence to support the validity of movements which demand that schools be taken over and run by local community groups. There is evidence which indicates that all people need to sense that they have some power over their own destinies and over the institutions which serve them. But, under the best conditions in our society, power is shared. As we have found in Chicago, it is possible to make provisions for sharing the power with the local residents within the framework of the law. Mr. McGeorge Bundy, President of the Ford Foundation, summarized this succinctly in a letter which he wrote to Mr. Julian Levi after he had reviewed the Memorandum of Agreement:

> . . . I can see . . . that someone has done a very neat job of reconciling the interests of the parties concerned. When there is sufficient skill and good will, there is every reason to work things out without disturbing existing legal arrangements . . . .

We close this report on an optimistic tone. We have been fortunate. Circumstances have often been on our side. We have been able to convert what at times appeared to be disaster into success. The United States Office of Education contributed substantially to the strength of our collaboration when it rejected our first proposal. We were able to create a strong collaborative force for inner-city school renewal and we now hope that the Office of Education will assist us in finding funds to move ahead. We further hope that officials in government will be interested in discussing with us how this Project and the experimental programs which should arise from it can make a significant contribution to urban education throughout the United States.

In one sense, we have accomplished much. In another sense we have done nothing. To be sure, feasibility to move ahead has been established. The administrative framework has been created. The experimental plan is ready for implementation. But all could vanish overnight. Collaborative agreements are perishable. They depend on mutual trust, which is always fragile in situations such as these. Unless something concrete happens in East Woodlawn soon, all we have done these past eighteen months will have been for naught. Even worse, the entire effort could be viewed as another one of the white man's parlor games.

REFERENCES

1. Ausubel, David P. "How Reversible Are the Cognitive and Motivational Effects of Cultural Deprivation?," *Education of the Disadvantaged*, ed. A. Harry Passow, *et al*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. 1967.

2. Bloom, Benjamin S., *et al*. *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: Cognitive Domain*. New York: David McKay Company, Inc. 1956.

3. Coleman, James S., *et al*. *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office. 1966.

4. Davis, Allison. *Social Class Influences Upon Learning*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1961.

5. Dreeben, Robert. "The Contributing of Schooling to the Learning of Norms," *Harvard Educational Review*, XXXVII, No. 2, 1967. p. 211-37.

6. Egelston, Martin. "The Status of Adult Education in Woodlawn." Chicago. 1967. (Mimeographed.)

7. Goodlad, John I. "Directions of Curriculum Change," *NEA Journal*, LV, No. 9, December 1966. p. 35.

8. Hauser, Philip M. *The Report to the Board of Education, City of Chicago, by the Advisory Panel on Integration of the Public Schools*. Chicago: Board of Education, City of Chicago. 1967.

9. Havighurst, Robert J. *The Public Schools of Chicago*. Chicago: Board of Education, City of Chicago. 1967.

10. Kontos, Peter G., and Murphy, James J. *Teaching Urban Youth*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1967.

11. Riessman, Frank. *The Culturally Deprived Child*. New York: Harper and Row. 1962.

12. U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and Bureau of the Census. *Social and Economic Conditions of Negroes in the United States*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office. 1967.

13. U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. *Racial Isolation in the Schools*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office. 1967.

APPENDIX A

WOODLAWN COMMUNITY BOARD FOR THE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER IN URBAN EDUCATION

1. The proposed Research and Development Center in Urban Education will seek to participate in the improvement of urban education in all its phases.

2. The initial and intensive efforts of the Research and Development Center in Urban Education will be focused on District 14 of the Chicago Public Schools which includes the neighborhoods of East Woodlawn, Hyde Park and South Kenwood. In addition, it is assumed that in time the Research and Development Center in Urban Education will develop working relationships with other urban neighborhoods, communities and school districts in Chicago, in the Chicago metropolitan area, and in the nation at large.

3. The programs of the Research and Development Center in Urban Education will include (a) an experimental and demonstration school as well as (b) a variety of research, development, demonstration, and dissemination projects. When the programs in either of these two categories affect a specific urban community, an organizational structure will be designed within the context of the Research and Development Center to represent three major partners: (1) the people of the community and the community organization; (2) the public school system; and (3) the university.

4. Therefore, in any proposed policy or activity of the Research and Development Center in Urban Education which directly affects the children, adults, community or community organization of Woodlawn, the three major partners are identified as: (1) The Woodlawn Organization; (2) the Chicago Public Schools; and (3) the University of Chicago.

5. It is recommended that a Woodlawn Community Board for the Research and Development Center in Urban Education be established immediately. The primary functions of the Woodlawn Community Board will be (a) to review and approve (and in some cases initiate) all proposed policies and activities of the Research and Development Center in Urban Education which will directly affect the children, adults, community or community organization of Woodlawn; and (b) to provide a channel of communication between the Research and Development Center and the larger institutions represented on the Woodlawn Community Board.

6. It is recommended that seven (7) representatives be selected by each of the component institutions (The Woodlawn Organization; the Chicago Public Schools; the University of Chicago) for the organization of the Woodlawn Community Board. Decisions relating to the replacement of members of each component group will be the sole responsibility of each component group.

7. Decisions of the Woodlawn Community Board must have concurrent approval of the three component institutions represented. Each component group will make a separate determination in caucus of what constitutes its position on any question before casting a single vote.

8. Whenever feasible, as determined by the Woodlawn Community Board, specific programs of the Research and Development Center in Urban Education will be conducted under the auspices of and through the structure of existing community organizations.

9. The provisions of Public Law 83-531 (Cooperative Research Act of 1954) as amended by Public Law 89-10 (Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965), pursuant to which the Commissioner of Education and the Office of Education are enabled to establish research and development centers, require that such a grant may be made to a college or university which must accept full responsibility for the maintenance and operation of the research and development center, including the selection and appointment of personnel and the construction and allocation of the budget.

10. Recommendations for programs and projects in the Research and Development Center may emanate from any source within the community and the component institutions. In each case, a proposed program which would directly affect the Woodlawn community would be approved or rejected by the Woodlawn Community Board.

11. If the Early Education Research Center portion of the University proposal is funded separately as part of a National Laboratory in Early Education, a specific method of establishing community involvement in that program will be developed. It is recommended that the Early Education Research Center activity fall under the jurisdiction of the Woodlawn Community Board whenever policies and programs of the Early Education Research Center directly affect the Woodlawn community.

12. The Woodlawn Community Board will be established to facilitate occasional but necessary direct communication from any community group or citizen, or university researcher, or public school teacher (as examples) to the Board itself. In its preliminary deliberations the Woodlawn Community Board will design a method for such direct access.

13. Further initial tasks of the Woodlawn Community Board will include collaboration and assistance in the analysis and developments of amendments for the proposal for a Research and Development Center in Urban Education (previously developed by the University of Chicago and now on file with the Commissioner of Education) in all aspects in which the proposal directly affects the Woodlawn community.

APPENDIX B

GENERAL STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND PROCEDURES

(Revised Draft-4/20/67)

Under a contract awarded to the University of Chicago by the United States Office of Education, the University of Chicago, The Woodlawn Organization, and the Chicago Public Schools have begun a cooperative study to develop ideas and recommendations for more effective urban education programs. The study is to be completed by November 30, 1967, when a final report will be made to the Office of Education and to the three cooperating organizations.

In the autumn of 1965, a University of Chicago proposal was designed for a Research and Development Center in Urban Education. Since that time, a major portion of the proposal devoted to pre-school research and training has become the Early Education Research Center which is part of a National Laboratory in Early Childhood Education. The present project is neither a research and development center nor a prelude to one. However, it is hoped that the Urban Education Developmental Project will provide additional opportunities for University faculty members who wish to conduct research in urban schools and community settings and train specialists for urban school programs.

In the long run, this is a project to search for ways to help people develop and implement ideas about improving education for urban children. The initial purpose of this study is to find whether there are ways in which the Woodlawn community, the Chicago Public Schools, and the University of Chicago can work together to improve the educational opportunities for children in Woodlawn.

The three institutions are interested in improving the quality of urban education. Each institution brings special interests to this Project:

1. The University is primarily interested in research and training.

2. The Woodlawn Organization is primarily interested in building leadership for the redevelopment of the community and in changing the basic educational program and the allocation of resources so that the educational system will be geared to the needs of the youth and the community.

3. The Chicago Public Schools are primarily interested in continually upgrading school programs by applying research findings and experimental evidence; by improving the pre-service and in-service education of school personnel; and by directly involving citizens and the community organization in planning the improvement of the schools.

It is important to keep in mind that this is a feasibility study. The funds available are for assessment and analysis, not specifically for action programs.

Four major questions confront the Project staff:

1. What are the educational problems as perceived by citizens and the community organization; by school personnel; and by the scholars of the educational process? What are the educational problems as revealed by the already available data?

2. What ideas can be identified and developed to help solve the problems which have been revealed?

3. What new ways of working together can be established so that these ideas can be implemented?

4. How can such programs be financed?

Two premises undergird this Project:

1. The sense of purpose and direction of each institution should be enhanced, not diminished by this Project.

2. Each institution has something vital to contribute to this Project. We are searching for ways to bring together our resources so that youth can benefit and the body of knowledge about education can be increased.

It is important to assess the educational problem in East Woodlawn from several vantage points: the community, the public schools, and the university. In general, two kinds of data are available: (1) specific information about the schools and community, and (2) perceptions of educational problems as held by Woodlawn citizens and The Woodlawn Organization; the Chicago Public Schools personnel and students; and faculty members of the University of Chicago. Questionnaires, interview techniques, and small group discussions will be used to obtain these data. Another significant task of the early phase of the planning period will be a systematic search of the available literature to determine what knowledge of the educational process in urban low-income communities is useful for this effort.

In addition to developing specific recommendations for research and action the Project staff will develop a broader design for future activity. The Project staff sees as a major task the searching out of methods to assist citizens, school personnel, and university researchers in developing ideas and programs for implementation in regular public schools. It is our feeling that the best place to plan and implement research and action programs for improving inner-city schools is in those very schools, and not in a separate facility. However, we know that certain research and design activities may demand isolation from the on-going school environment and that some projects may best be launched initially and evaluated in a relatively pressure-free environment. Therefore, the Project staff is prepared to consider the creation of an experimental center, possibly in rental space in the community or in the Museum of Science and Industry.

There are no additional commitments at this time to preconceived programs or patterns of collaboration. Rather, the search is an open one. We suspect that our inquiry and dialogue will identify problems of mutual interest and concern. If recommendations are made to move ahead in an attempt to solve identified problems, the people and institutions involved will decide whether to do so individually or collectively.

APPENDIX C

REPORT OF MEETINGS OF SCOTT AND DUMAS TEACHERS TO DISCUSS THE AFTER-SCHOOL PROGRAM

(8/15/67)

Scott Teachers

Thirty teachers from the Scott School participated in the discussion. The discussion was moderated by Willard J. Congreve, Urban Education Developmental Project staff, who prepared the following report.

The majority of Scott teachers present felt that the program should be continued, but they would like to have the following modifications instituted into the program:

1. Some of the time and money devoted to the class sessions should be used for a comprehensive institute for the After-School Program teachers in the development of remedial techniques, especially in the area of reading. Teachers do not know the best techniques and should be given assistance in learning them. They want this institute conducted by a person who is COMPETENT in teaching these techniques: one with a proven record; one who knows the problems they are facing. They also want the option of telling whoever is responsible for setting up the institute that the leader of the institute is not effective and have him replaced (with no hard feelings).

2. They would like to try an early morning program, beginning at 8:00. There was skepticism expressed as to whether the children would come, but it should be tried.

3. They want the materials to be selected by the faculty, not imposed upon them.

4. They want real diagnostic tests, not the metropolitan reading tests. They want to know what the child's specific needs are and they want to have the techniques and materials to do something about these needs.

5. They feel that class size should be limited to 10--that is an outside maximum--so they can actually do something for the children who come.

Other less urgent, but nonetheless important modifications they would like to have considered are:

1. It was felt that the roles of those persons who are affiliated with the program but not teaching a class should be re-examined. The class teachers in the program would like to have an opportunity to participate in determining these roles.

2. Food distribution at the beginning of the program should continue, but that should not be one of the jobs of teachers who are not teaching specific classes.

3. There should be a re-examination of the relationship between field trips and the purposes of the After-School Program. The field trips should make sense to the program and to the children who go on the trips.

4. Teachers should have an opportunity to get into the homes of the children, to get to know the parents, so they have a better understanding of the problems with which they are dealing.

5. There needs to be a supervisory person who is an expert in the teaching of remedial reading, who is available to work with the teachers and to provide the necessary help and follow-up after the initial training institute. This person should not just drop in for a moment or two, but should be a working partner with the teachers.

6. There was some dissatisfaction expressed with the distribution schedule of the pay checks. This was not elaborated upon.

Dumas Teachers

Nineteen teachers and the principal of the Dumas School participated in the discussion. The discussion was moderated by Bernice J. Wolfson, Urban Education Developmental Project staff, who prepared the following report.

The Dumas School faculty discussed the After-School Program and possible alternatives. In general, the group attending felt that some modifications and improvements in the After-School Program were needed. As a group, they appeared to reject the possible alternative of two additional teachers in place of the After-School Program. Teacher aides were also mentioned as an alternative, but the subject was not fully discussed.

A variety of feelings about needed modifications were expressed. These included the need for (1) activities of greater interest to the children; (2) inclusion of primary children; (3) possible broadening of curriculum or change of emphasis; and (4) use of teachers qualified for particular activity.

Suggestions were also made for consultation of community members and for development of guidelines and plans with the child's regular teacher. Desirability of time for planning and meeting together of teachers in the After-School Program and need for additional guidance classes were also mentioned.

Three modifications which the group agreed upon were:

1. Children should be allowed to participate in the program regardless of achievement or grade level, i.e., interested primary children should

not be excluded nor should children of average or above average achievement.

2. Attendance should be flexible, i.e., pupils may drop out and enter at various times during the year.

3. Class size should be continued low, i.e., 15 or less.

APPENDIX D

EXPERIMENTAL SUBSTITUTE PROGRAM

During the spring of 1967 the staff of the Urban Education Developmental Project investigated the availability of daily substitute teachers for the elementary and secondary schools of the community. That inquiry revealed that slightly in excess of 62% of all requests for substitute teachers made by the principals of the nine elementary schools of the community were unfilled during the 1966-67 school year. Approximately 20% of similar requests made by the principal of the Hyde Park High School were unfilled. It was also determined that on an average day in the 1966-67 school year the nine elementary schools needed 16 daily substitute teachers and the high school needed 8 such persons. The study also revealed that specific schools in East Woodlawn encountered more difficulty than others in obtaining substitute teachers; for example, in one upper grade center the unfilled requests for daily substitutes often exceeded 90%.

Working in conjunction with the Woodlawn Community Board, the Project staff outlined the various kinds of personnel resources which might be useful in the East Woodlawn Schools, including volunteers, substitutes, and fully certificated professionals. The staff then decided to test the feasibility of collaborative action by confronting the problem of finding substitute teachers to reduce the daily unmet needs. It was determined that such a project could be designed and implemented without substantial imposition on the time of available staff; yet it would require the collaboration of the three institutions to be successful.

A position paper was prepared by the Project staff outlining the objectives of an experimental substitute pool and raising a number of questions related to the development and administration of the program. The questions were considered during August by Dr. Melnick, District Superintendent, Mr. Willard Congreve, Project Director, Dr. John Erzinger, Assistant Superintendent for Personnel, and Mr. Raymond Principe, Director of the Substitute Center for the Board of Education.

It was agreed that District 14 could recruit substitute teachers and assure them of assignment to a specific school or pair of schools in East Woodlawn instead of being available for city wide assignment. Further, the administration of the program would be handled jointly by the Substitute Center (in the central offices of the school system) and the District 14 office. The Project staff accepted responsibility for advertising, recruiting, and the initial interviewing of candidates. The District 14 staff agreed to assist candidates in becoming certified and assign them to schools. Program planning, orientation, nurture, evaluation, and reporting were viewed as joint responsibilities.

Advertising was begun in September. In spite of great care in preparing the announcements and press releases, the Schools Committee of The Woodlawn Organization raised objections to the program. The parents involved did not understand that the search underway was for daily substitute teachers to cover classes for teachers absent due to illness or other official reasons. They thought that the substitute teachers identified would be employed to teach on a full-time basis in regular classroom assignments. The Associate Project Director representing T.W.O. clarified the misunderstanding and assured the parents that we did not plan to staff the schools with second-rate, uncertified teachers.

A strategic decision was made just prior to the beginning of advertising. It was clearly recognized that it would be difficult to predict not only how many persons might be interested in substitute teaching in East Woodlawn, but even more critically how many might be ready for certification by the Board of Examiners of the Chicago Public Schools under certificates currently available for substitute teachers. It was determined that recruiting should proceed and candidates should be identified prior to requesting any waivers from the Board of Examiners.

Project staff members, a District 14 official, a resident of Woodlawn identified by T.W.O. initiated contacts through informal channels, letters to members of the University community, and articles in city and community newspapers. By December 10th, the records revealed: 28 persons interested in teacher aide work; 16 persons properly certified for daily substitute teaching who were interested in working in East Woodlawn; 29 individuals eager to teach as substitutes but not qualified for certification; and 12 persons falling into a miscellaneous category (including aliens, and persons who had attended an unaccredited college or university, for example) who could not be considered as candidates for the experimental program.

The significant category for consideration clearly had become the one including the 29 prospective daily substitutes who did not at present appear to be able to meet the certification requirements of the Board of Examiners. Actually, it had become clear in late November that this category would include a fairly substantial number of people. However, up to that date, we had agreed to not ask for any special dispensations. When this large pool of people who could be used became known to us, Mr. Congreve, Dr. Melnick, and Dr. Erzinger met with members of the Board of Examiners who agreed to issue a limited provisional certificate to persons with a degree from an accredited college or university and allow them to teach in grades K-8 in only the East Woodlawn public schools. It was also agreed that the total number of such substitutes would not exceed 50 and the program would be evaluated in June of 1968. As of this date, the substitute problem in East Woodlawn has been greatly relieved.

Crucial to the success of this collaborative project was the designation of the effort as "limited and experimental," and the decision by the Board of Examiners to issue the limited provisional certificates. Our initial hunch was verified: there are persons interested in substitute teaching and who can be encouraged to work in inner-city schools. It is true that such collaboration requires a certain amount of good will and patience; and that changing existing patterns of operation takes time. However, when there is an urgent need and a capacity for change, people seem to come forward and bring about the new relationships needed.

Finally, this experimental project was initiated at a time when the Chicago Public Schools were taking the first steps to partially decentralize the system. Thus, this project became a test of both inter-institutional collaboration as well as decentralization of a program to the district level. As the program proceeds and grows it will provide a valuable base upon which broader personnel decentralization programs might be built. Such decentralization makes it possible to personalize contacts and help reduce or eliminate the annoyance or fear which tends to be stimulated by a large school system. Providing personalized assistance to prospective candidates in meeting the standards and jumping the essential certification hurdles may prove to be an excellent way to recruit the people needed to fill vacancies and, at the same time, maintain high standards.

APPENDIX E

CINEMATIC SOCIAL INQUIRY PROJECT

During the spring of 1967 members of the Urban Education Developmental Project staff viewed a film titled Home For Life, a documentary in the cinema verite style depicting life in the Drexel Home for the aged located in East Woodlawn at 6140 South Drexel Avenue. The film was produced and directed by Mr. Gerald Temaner and filmed and edited by Mr. Gordon Quinn. It participated recently in the Edinburgh International Film Festival; the New York Film Festival; and the Chicago International Film Festival, where it was given the Chicago Award.

During the assessment study of the East Woodlawn schools, Project staff members came to realize that the data being obtained from a systematic effort were not yielding knowledge of sufficient quality about interpersonal relationships problems in both the school and the school community. Home For Life suggested to the Project staff that a cinema verite film or series of films depicting the life in an inner-city school and its community might accomplish a number of purposes: (a) supplement and complement data obtained from standard research and observation; (b) present the school-community situation to those responsible and interested in such a way as to create a desire to change the inner-city public school through the involvement of many community residents, particularly parents; (c) disseminate information; and (d) provide a critical experience in pre- and in-service training of school personnel.

A small developmental grant was obtained from the Wieboldt Foundation to permit the filmmakers to join the Project staff and to test the feasibility of creating such a film in a school. This study was conducted at the Carnegie Special Summer School in District 14. During the summer the filmmakers also carried on sustained dialogue with representatives of the three collaborating institutions on the questions of procedure and the appropriate subjects for the cinematic inquiry. The filmmakers thus helped staff members from the school, the community, and the university to broaden their conception of the appropriateness of this kind of cinematic social inquiry. By introducing the filmmakers and Home For Life to both the school and community people, enthusiasm and support for a school film was obtained. For example, after viewing Home For Life, Dr. Curtis C. Melnick, Superintendent of District 14, concluded that school people would be well served by a film which gave them the opportunity to view themselves through the eyes of others. The filmmakers found the Carnegie School environment (as recorded by tape recordings and still photographs) rich and of such substantial quality as to yield a number of films. In addition, the three institutions increased their enthusiasm during the feasibility study. The Woodlawn Organization representative agreed to provide the necessary liaison with the community assisting the filmmakers in obtaining necessary footage in homes and other settings in the East Woodlawn neighborhood. University support has been extended to include the legal advice necessary to settling details regarding ownership and distribution of the finished products. The most important and necessary support from the Chicago Public Schools system has also been obtained. The results of the feasibility study have reinforced the enthusiasm of Dr. Melnick and the principal of the Elementary School where the major filming will probably be done.

The feasibility study, completed in early September, thus provided the basis for a proposal to search for funds to support filming in 1968. Hopefully, the filming will take place in one Elementary School in the Woodlawn Experimental District. In discussing alternatives, the Project staff and filmmakers have decided that instead of making only one film it will be more valuable to conduct a cinematic study which should yield a number of films on different subjects and of varying lengths. It is anticipated that one long (90 minute) film similar in form to Home For Life will be created. Short teaching films, particularly of classroom sequences, should also be the result of this study.

Because no scripts are written for the films, Mr. Temaner and Mr. Quinn cannot predict specifically the nature of the proposed films. The actual subject matter of a film is extracted from film footage gathered. The men spend a great deal of time in preliminary research prior to filming which helps them determine the focus. In the Drexel Home, for example, several weeks of preliminary study was required before the filmmakers decided that the best theme could be found by filming the entrance of new residents into the home, a time in the lives of elderly people when their feelings and concerns are exposed and when the institution must reveal itself in part to them. With regard to a film about an East Woodlawn school and its community, we suspect that the film will be concerned with the student-teacher relationships. However, we cannot be sure, nor shall we try to push in this direction. Hopefully, filming will be done during the spring, summer, and autumn to enable the filmmakers to follow students into the community summer life and then back to school in the fall. Such an approach should illuminate the relationships between school and community through the lives of children, singly and in family and peer groupings.

The film should be of interest to a number of specific audiences: (a) school, community, and university personnel of the experimental district for both in-service and pre-service training; (b) school and community personnel in other East Woodlawn schools; (c) school personnel attending in-service workshops at the University of Chicago and elsewhere; and (d) other in-service training programs during the school year involving teachers, administrators, parents, and students, and the filmmakers.

It is entirely possible that the film(s) produced may be appropriate as a television documentary on a national network; for training purposes in many colleges and universities; as an informational film for other inner-city community organizations; and as a means of assistance for planners in other urban education projects. Clearly, the film should receive wide use in the Chicago Public Schools system, particularly in districts serving neighborhoods similar to East Woodlawn.

APPENDIX F

IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY AND ACHIEVEMENT IN EAST WOODLAWN

A Proposal Under Consideration

(8/4/67)

This memorandum outlines a rationale being considered by the Project staff for a continuing program . . . . It is tentative and seeks to generate discussion and ideas from the representatives of the three institutions involved in this project.

Rationale for a Continuing Program

In designing programs to facilitate higher levels of educational achievement among students attending inner-city schools it would be imprudent to ignore the evidence of the recent Office of Education report on equality of educational opportunity (3). A major conclusion of this study is: "That schools bring little influence to bear on a child's achievement that is independent of his background and general social context." (3)

This suggests that programs which focus upon formal educational structures and processes alone are likely to produce limited returns. The perspective required is one which sees the schools as one element, and not the most dominant in the developmental experience of the child. Family and peers are more influential in shaping basic attitudes and the schools are dependent upon students absorbing a positive orientation toward them from these sources if they are to effectively carry out their educational function. Among the attitudes which are "extremely highly corelated to educational achievement," the Office of Education report concludes, are those that reflect "a sense of control of the environment, or a belief in the responsiveness of the environment." (3) Again these attitudes are little influenced by variations in school characteristics and are markedly weak among Negro respondents. This fact is suggestive of a relatively high level of alienation among this sector of the population, of which there has been other, more dramatic, evidence recently.

These findings indicate that one of the most fundamental tasks facing those concerned with improving inner-city education is to mobilize parental support. This means providing appropriate structures through which residents can express demands upon the schools and participate in their control. As their 'sense of control' over this aspect of the social environment develops, hopefully it will be generalized to other areas, and transmitted, by example, to the children. This will provide one of the necessary ingredients for increased educational achievement for children and adults.

In summary, we conclude that the redevelopment of Woodlawn must be controlled by the people of Woodlawn and their community organization, The Woodlawn Organization. Those individuals and institutions wishing to assist in the processes of community redevelopment may do so only at the request of the community and the community organization. Finally, we conclude that attempts to improve educational opportunity and achievement, both inside and outside the walls of the schools, must be viewed in the more basic context of community redevelopment. Such a premise does not infer that community redevelopment must precede educational redevelopment. It does imply that programs related to school improvement must be viewed continually in the larger framework.

The Development of a Community Education Center in East Woodlawn

Utilizing the stated rationale, we propose that a Woodlawn Community Education Center be established in East Woodlawn. It would seem feasible for the Center to be organized as a not-for-profit corporation. The Corporation would serve as a holding company in the acquisition of funds and staff from various sources. The objective of the Center would be to design and implement action and research programs specifically designed to bring about major improvements in educational opportunity and achievement for youth and adults of the community, both in and out of schools.

The Center should be organized by The Woodlawn Organization, with the potential assistance of the Chicago Public Schools and the University of Chicago, and should be physically located in East Woodlawn. Initially the area to be served would include that part of the broader Woodlawn community which falls within the boundaries of District 14 of the Chicago Public Schools.

The director of the Center would be selected by The Woodlawn Organization. The Center would be governed by a Board of Directors. Majority membership on the Board should be held by Woodlawn residents and community organization members designated by The Woodlawn Organization. Some Board members might be selected from the Chicago Public Schools and the University of Chicago.

The Community Education Center would be in a position to initiate requests for funds to implement specifically designed programs. In addition, the Center could receive funds obtained by other cooperating institutions under subcontract arrangements. Based on the experience of the Urban Education Developmental Project and the growing sense of collaboration which has characterized that effort, it is assumed that the programs of the Center would seek to extend the cooperation of The Woodlawn Organization, the Chicago Public Schools, and the University of Chicago in the immediate area of East Woodlawn as well as greater Woodlawn. The Center would employ and utilize specialists and technicians from the public school system, universities, and private industry, both on a permanent and temporary basis, to carry out programs established by the Board of Directors and the Director.

In identifying problems in the community specifically related to education in schools and outside schools, the Center would conduct necessary research to provide an analytic base for both the understanding and treatment of problems. Thus, each program design would include the development of new knowledge as well as an action program and a means of assessing that action. . . .

The Community Education Center would maintain as a primary purpose the gradual and deliberate increase of community participation in the schools and the development of community control over the educational activities of the community, in behalf of the citizens of East Woodlawn. Such control does not in any sense jeopardize the professional rights and responsibilities of individuals who work in the schools of the community. . . . The Woodlawn Community Education Center would create examples of professional action responsive to and responsible directly to the community. . . .

APPENDIX G

TOWARD THE CREATION OF AN EXPERIMENTAL SCHOOL DISTRICT IN EAST WOODLAWN

Discussion Paper for: Meeting of Woodlawn Community Board, 9/27/1967

. . .

III. Development of a Strategic Basis for Change in Schools

We have described an environment for teaching and learning which is different from that environment found in most American public schools, be they urban, suburban, or village in locale. Let us move to the next question, one which has demanded considerable attention in the past several months: "How can a school or a cluster of schools be converted from one basic plan of operation to another, from one basic philosophy of teaching and learning to another?" We refer here to basic strategy rather than the day-to-day details of action. Two alternatives have seemed most feasible to us. The first method might be termed the "self-renewing method"; the second can be called the "acceptance-of-a-focus method." The phrases are crude but we hope they are descriptive.

In the first method all persons affiliated with the school are convened in group sessions to identify the problems and become knowledgeable about the relevant theoretical formulations. Then, making use of necessary time and other resources which can be provided, they determine courses of action to be taken. Using this method, whether or not renewal takes place is left largely to the personnel in the school. It assumes that if the present staff is given time and resources it will renew itself.

In the second method, a small group of individuals who have the time and additional resources, as well as a commitment to bring about change, develops an initial focus or thrust which the personnel of the school to be renewed are asked to accept. Then the personnel in the school, along with the additional people who must become involved in order to achieve the focus, come together and work out the means by which the objectives of the plan will be achieved. People presently in the school who feel they cannot commit themselves to the focus are given the opportunity to withdraw. Those who remain are committed to working out the means whereby the explicit goals of cooperation can be achieved.

The staff of the Urban Education Developmental Project proposes that the "acceptance-of-a-focus method" be adopted. Three reasons are offered in support of this recommendation.

1. The "acceptance-of-a-focus method" does not preclude utilization of the practices of the "self-renewing method." We feel that once the direction is clear and goals are set the responsibilities for individual and institutional renewal can be accepted in substantial measure by the

teachers and administrators of the schools involved in the experiment.

2. Time is of the essence; the "acceptance-of-a-focus method" will permit us to move ahead more rapidly to establish the demonstration of public education of high quality that is needed in East Woodlawn.

3. Change in East Woodlawn schools will be created out of dialogue and tension which will exist between persons who are presently in the schools and persons who are and will be associated with the Project staff. Conflict is anticipated as natural and healthy and not deplorable.

The responsible contribution of the Project staff is the creation of such a focus or strategy for change. This focus has not emanated naturally from the school system alone. This likewise is not deplorable.

Nevertheless, the Project staff has implemented the thinking of University, public school, and community representatives. The strategy or focus is not imposed by an arbitrary observer. Furthermore, we expect that the strategy or focus will be refined over a period of time as a result of interaction of Project staff with teachers, administrators, parents, children, and scholars.

An additional question must also be confronted: "To what extent can or should the effort at school improvement involve all of the East Woodlawn schools from the outset?" The answer to this question lies within the realm of practicality. Can enough personnel and resources be brought together to provide a thrust which will make any difference in all of the East Woodlawn schools? Or is it necessary to limit the initial intensive activity to a few schools with the understanding that there will be dissemination of results to the other Woodlawn schools? If the intensive activity is directed toward a particular concern, such as reading at the primary level, a single effort perhaps could be carried on in all the schools. But we want to create an entirely new educational environment for children, one which embraces not only the educational life which takes place within the school but also the life outside. Thus, the most feasible strategy is one which involves a reasonably small population in a program where the focus or thrust is clearly determined.

The staff of the Project recommends that three schools composing a K-12 "stream" in East Woodlawn be identified and designated as an experimental district. It is further recommended that the focus for acceptance in the schools of the experimental district be what we describe, again roughly, as "people working together helping people."

IV. Description of Schools Where "People Help People"

One of the main problems existing in East Woodlawn schools is the lack of rapport among the various groups within the school, the home, the community, and between the home and the school. Therefore, a school in which the parties involved help each other would be committed to developing specific and pervasive cooperative relationships. Herbert Thelen and others have carried on pilot programs in which outstanding results have been obtained when children have been given the opportunity to help other children in the learning process. However, the focus must be more than children helping children; it must be expanded to people helping people, within the school, between the school and the home, and between the school and the community.

The attitudes held by the members of different groups reflect and are reinforced by the lack of rapport and misunderstanding. Attempting to attack these attitudes directly would be most difficult. Rather, we would bring persons of the various groups together to work on their one mutual concern--the education of their children. As they work together in school improvement, attitudes which enhance working relationships will develop.

. . .

V. Creating an Administrative Design for Collaboration and Action

Up to this point we have talked about four things: (1) some of the problems we must begin to solve in the East Woodlawn schools; (2) our convictions regarding the child and how he learns; (3) a broad strategy for institutional change in the schools; and (4) our vision of schools where people help people in a continuing pattern of cooperative action. But to solve problems, help children, implement the strategy, and create new schools in present buildings we must create an appropriate administrative structure for the experimental district.

A prerequisite to identifying alternative administrative designs is the establishment of criteria which the design finally selected must meet. These criteria should rise out of the needs and problems which have been identified as well as the output criteria which operational programs would hope to meet.

One of the most fundamental tasks facing those concerned with improving inner-city education is to mobilize parental support. This means providing appropriate structures through which residents can express demands upon the schools and participate in their operations. As their "sense of control" over this aspect of the social environment develops, hopefully it will be generalized to other areas, and transmitted by example to the children.

The view of the Project staff, supported by research evidence, contends that one component of whatever design is established must be active, meaningful, and honest involvement of grass roots community people, preferably parents, in the programs and the projects which are to be initiated for improvement of the schools.

But the design must take into consideration other important factors as well as parent involvement. The entire problem areas of teaching-learning suggests that much work is needed in the retraining of teachers, in the development of appropriate materials, and in the design of learning experiences which will captivate the productive energies of children. If the preceding argument for involving parents is valid, a similar argument must be made for involving the actors in the teaching-learning arena, namely the principals, the teachers, and the children. Just as the energies and enthusiasms of the parents must be released so that they can begin to participate in and support the activities of the school, so must the creative energies and enthusiasms of the persons in the school be released. This means that whatever administrative design is established for school improvement it must permit programs and projects to be developed in which the teachers, principals, and children of the school are able to play their rightful roles.

A third factor must be considered. Even with the active involvement of all persons affiliated with (students and personnel) or affected by (parents and community) the school, there remains the matter of the need for additional input to insure that new programs will be fashioned and implemented to alleviate the problems. The administrative design must, therefore, involve the resources of one or more universities or regional educational laboratories which can help teachers design, implement, and evaluate innovations or experimental activities.

The administrative design must also contain, as a fourth factor, a research and training component which will insure the ready availability of resources which are needed to meet the problems which have been or will be defined by the constituents of the school.

In addition, the design must make possible an atmosphere within which experimentation and innovation can flourish. Present limitations on creativity of individuals or schools; on the selection, assignment, and use of personnel; and on the identification and allocation of resources must be removed. The administrative structure must provide for sufficient independence from the school system to make possible the formulation, implementation, and evaluation of programs which indeed confront the problems which have been identified.

The new projects and programs will undoubtedly cost money. Retraining cannot be done without major expenditures; additional personnel means increased financial support. Furthermore, if the space and other physical resource needs are to be met, considerable money for capital expenditures will be required. A sixth criterion which the administrative design must meet is that it will make possible the location and receipt of additional funds for the experimental unit.

The amount of money currently being spent on education in Woodlawn and in other similar communities is insufficient. But what amount will be enough? To determine the answer to this question will require a design which makes possible a cost-quality analysis of the operation of one or a few schools. This will require control over both the expenditures and the educational process.

Finally, it will not be sufficient if the program which emanates from this feasibility study results in quality education in but a few schools in Woodlawn. What is also important is that other schools in Woodlawn as well as other schools in similar communities eventually benefit from the work in the schools initially selected for treatment. This means that the design selected must incorporate as an eighth factor means to communicate results to and influence the development of similar programs in other schools.

The criteria for the administrative design are thus determined: (1) parent and community involvement; (2) teacher, student, and principal involvement; (3) input from universities and other sources; (4) research and training input; (5) freedom to experiment; (6) appropriate financing; (7) cost-quality analysis; and (8) rapid dissemination of results. Now let us turn to a consideration of specific alternatives which may meet these criteria.

A. Plan Whereby the Chicago Board of Education Retains Complete Control

The Chicago Board of Education could establish an experimental district within local District 14, consisting of one to three schools. (The preference of the Urban Education Developmental Project staff is an experimental district consisting of a stream of three schools: K-6, 7-8, 9-12.) A director will be appointed to operate the experimental district. He would report to the Superintendent of District 14. The experimental district would contain a parent advisory committee; administration, faculty, and student involvement in program development; innovative and experimental programs; and a cost-benefit analysis program. The Board of Education could turn over to the director of the experimental district special powers which would permit the schools to respond to parent and community interests; involve teachers in the planning and implementation of curricula; and, in a sense, create a unique set of schools. The Woodlawn Organization could be invited to name the parent advisory committees and the University could enter into contract with the experimental district for research and training activities. In addition, the present Woodlawn Community Board could function as a policy review committee, responding and reacting to programs which were established by the district.

There are several advantages inherent in this arrangement. Although the schools could be highly experimental, they would remain as distinct units in the Chicago Public Schools system. Therefore, dissemination of results would be facilitated. The University could maintain a detachment which has been suggested by some scholars as an essential condition for a university. It could contract to provide research and training in areas which it felt appropriate. The parents and community would be represented. Research, evaluation, and cost-benefit analysis could be undertaken. All variations in policy regarding the assignment and use of personnel could be negotiated by the Chicago Public Schools administrative staff and Board of Education. Title III funds could be applied to such a district.

What are the disadvantages? The greatest one is the danger inherent in asking an already overburdened administrative unit to set up and operate a project which by its nature will undoubtedly tear at the very foundation of the administrative unit itself. It is quite possible that because of this conflict the experimental district would never get off the ground. However, this weakness could be offset by a clearly established agreement contract.

A second disadvantage, closely allied to the first, is that because of the close administrative attachments which the director of the experimental district will have with the District Superintendent, as well as the fact that this director will obviously be viewed as a member of the Chicago Public Schools establishment, the director may not feel free to support the development of programs which take issue with the policies and procedures of the school system.

Finally, although provision for meaningful parent and community involvement can be made in the specifications, such involvement may not be fulfilled in experimental district programs. The history of school-parent relations in low-income communities throughout the United States indicates that at best the school has taken a tolerating and patronizing attitude toward parents.

B. Plan Whereby Complete Control is Placed in the Hands of a Community Dominated Board

It is conceivable that a separate not-for-profit corporation could be established which would take over the control and direction of the experimental district. Such a corporation would serve as a holding company in the acquisition of funds and staff from various sources. The objective of the Center would be to develop and implement action and research programs specifically designed to bring about major improvements in educational opportunity and achievement for youth and adults of the community, both in and out of schools.

The Center would be organized by The Woodlawn Organization, with the potential assistance of the Chicago Public Schools and the University of Chicago. It would be governed by a Board of Directors which would select the director of the district. Majority membership on the Board would be held by Woodlawn residents and community organization members designated by The Woodlawn Organization. Some Board members might be selected from the Chicago Public Schools and the University of Chicago.

The Center would initiate requests for funds to implement specifically designed programs. In addition, it could receive funds obtained by other cooperating institutions under sub-contract arrangements. The Center would invite the cooperation of The Woodlawn Organization, the Chicago Public Schools, and the University of Chicago in the immediate area of East Woodlawn as in greater Woodlawn. It would employ and utilize available specialists and technicians from the public schools system, universities, and private industry, both on a permanent and temporary basis, to carry out programs established by the Board of Directors and the director.

This plan insures meaningful involvement of the Woodlawn community in determing policies and procedures for the operation of the experimental district. It would make possible an immediate test of whether such involvement will bridge the alienation gap between school and community.

Success of such a plan would be contingent upon the appropriate negotiation of several important matters. Teachers would probably have to go on leave and become employees of the Center. The Board of Education would have to guarantee the present support level for the experimental schools with the understanding that the additional money needed for research and training and development would be sought from other sources. The Center would probably want to be able to purchase routine supplies and equipment through Chicago Public Schools channels to maintain the buying power of the funds budgeted.

The plan has disadvantages. Some funds, such as those available under Title III, may not be available to this experimental district, unless it could be designated by the State of Illinois as a legal school district. This action would require extensive litigation. Dissemination might be more difficult. Even under an arrangement less formal than establishing a separate legal district, the schools might be viewed as so different from the others as to make generalization of results difficult.

Furthermore, the experimental Center might have difficulty in mustering necessary resources. Of course, if the Center could attract substantive funds, it would be in a strong bargaining position with several universities and other institutions to contract for the training, development, and research programs which are needed. Sufficient funding may well be the crucial element in the success of this plan.

C. Plan Whereby the University of Chicago Contracts to Operate the Experimental District

Another alternative would be for the University of Chicago to contract with the Chicago Board of Education to operate the experimental district for a period of five years with a policy board made up of Woodlawn people. Under an arrangement similar to that established for the Argonne National Laboratory, the University would receive those funds from the Chicago Board of Education which are normally budgeted to operate the selected schools. It would seek additional monies to provide the programs essential to meeting the eight criteria outlined above. All personnel remaining in the schools would be placed on leave from the Chicago Board of Education with no loss of status, seniority, or retirement benefits and be placed on the staff of the University of Chicago. The director of the project would be appointed by the University. Policy decisions would be made by the local community board and implemented by the director. Specific stipulations regarding the appropriate roles of the three collaborating institutions would be worked out in the contract.

Such an arrangement would have considerable advantages over the not-for-profit corporation plan. It would preserve community involvement and it would also insure the involvement and commitment of University resources. The criteria established previously would be met through programs and projects set up under the contractual arrangements. The difficulties regarding legal responsibilities would be alleviated as the University, an established legal agency, accepts responsibility for the operation of the schools. Transfer of staff to the University payroll seems reasonable; the apprehensions which some faculty might have about working for a newly established not-for-profit corporation should be reduced considerably if they were to be paid by the University.

The Chicago Board of Education would be in a stronger legal position in entering into a contract with the University than in entering into a similar contract with a newly established corporation. Finally, because the contract would be for a limited period of time, the experimental schools might not lose their identity with the public sector; therefore, dissemination should be possible. If one or more of the schools in the experimental district developed quality programs which were sufficiently researched and analyzed for cost-benefits before the five-year period had expired, they could be returned to the control of the Chicago Board of Education and others could be named to the district in their place.

However, it would be important for the director of the experimental district to maintain close contacts with the public school officials during the experimental period. Unless such closeness were maintained, there would be the danger (in spite of what has been set forth above) that these schools might develop an aura similar to that of campus laboratory schools, an aura which makes them so unique in the eyes of public school personnel that they are no longer seen as characterizing anything which public school personnel feel can be replicated in their schools. Here lies the inherent weakness of this alternative. One additional weakness might be in the area of financing. Such an arrangement may preclude Title III assistance.

D. A Tripartite Collaborative Plan

One final alternative attempts to combine the strengths of the previous ones presented. Under this arrangement, the Chicago Board of Education would establish the experimental district under the administrative hand of the General Superintendent of Schools, but he in turn would place this district in the hands of a director specifically appointed to carry out programs and projects designed to meet the eight criteria. Relationships with the local district superintendent and other administrative officers would be negotiated in the contract stipulations. Although technically the experimental district would remain under the legal control of the Chicago Board of Education, the director and his staff would be sufficiently autonomous so as to be able to respond to the Woodlawn Community Board which would review and approve all programs established which effect the children and parents. Under such a plan the tripartite collaboration established in the Woodlawn Community Board would extend into the experimental district.

The director of the experimental district would be hired by the Woodlawn Community Board. In one sense, the director would become an assistant district superintendent in charge of the experimental district. He would be legally responsible to the General Superintendent of Schools, but he would also be responsible to the Woodlawn Community Board.

The staff of the Urban Education Developmental Project recommends this plan over the other three. Under it all of the eight criteria could be met. The presence of parent councils for each school and the role of the Woodlawn Community Board as a policy board would insure the involvement of the parents and community. Projects and proposals could be initiated by any representative group. One function of The Woodlawn Organization contingent of the Woodlawn Community Board would be to bring to the attention of the director at regular intervals problems which the group feels should be investigated and acted upon. It would be the responsibility of the director and his staff to respond to these concerns in the same manner that they would respond to concerns which have come to their attention through other collaborating institutions.

Under such arrangements, each of the three collaborating institutions could seek funds which could be applied to programs and projects in the experimental district. Title III money could be sought from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 by the Chicago Public Schools. Title IV money from the same act and money from the Higher Education Act could be sought by the University. Money from the Office of Juvenile Delinquency, the Labor Department, and the Office of Economic Opportunity could be sought by The Woodlawn Organization. All institutions could seek private funds.

An additional advantage of the collaborative scheme just described is that dissemination of results would be facilitated because the schools would remain part of the Chicago Public Schools system. The necessary freedom could be stipulated in the Board of Education report which could outline clearly the prerogatives of the director. This report would become a kind of contract. . . .

APPENDIX H

EXPERIMENTAL SCHOOLS IN EAST WOODLAWN: A PROPOSAL

(11/30/67)

. . .

D. CURRICULUM FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL SCHOOLS

. . .

Two important questions that the experimental district must confront are: "Why are some children excited with and involved in the learning programs?" and "To what extent are these unique programs providing appropriate experiences for at least some of the children?" But as these questions are pursued, the evidence is still clear that major and pervasive changes based upon the best knowledge we have about the child as a learner and the processes of learning are required in the East Woodlawn schools. Without faith in the capacity of the learner we cannot teach. Without continued examination of how and why children learn we cannot hope for learning of high quality to occur in the schools.

In outlining the curriculum for the experimental schools, what is needed is an extension of these basic statements and a few specific examples of what will happen in the experimental schools. This extension is offered with some degree of hesitation, because it may be misinterpreted as a contradiction to the basic operating principle that the persons in the schools and community will participate in working out the details of the curriculum. Therefore, it is again emphasized that as statements approach specificity they should be interpreted as examples or as slices of the proposed reality.

Dr. Mark R. Shedd, newly appointed General Superintendent of Schools in Philadelphia, commented in his May 18, 1967, address to principals and central office staff that Philadelphia's experimental district will be mainly concerned with "the development of a so-called 'affective' curriculum to accompany our cognitive curriculum . . . . Its essence is the relationship which exists between pupil and teacher and pupil and pupil." In the East Woodlawn experimental schools Dr. Shedd's definition would be enlarged to include the parents and other school staff in the concern for meaningful interrelationships. Within the thrust of developing the affective curriculum, the schools which are selected and their communities would be viewed as laboratories for the study and development of curriculum content, methods, and materials which are relevant to the life space of the child and which meet his learning and other developmental needs. These schools and their communities would be considered appropriate for testing out a variety of content and materials all designed to get kids "turned on" and keep them actively involved in activities which will result in appropriate and meaningful learning.

While a major emphasis in the experimental schools will be upon finding methods of encouraging learning, we do not wish to relegate to a minor status the question of what is to be taught. The assessment data contain numerous reports from teachers who express concern about the content they are expected to impart to youngsters, while children often report that frustration with inappropriate content and/or inadequate materials contributes to a classroom environment which children interpret as alien to their needs and interests. . . .

Nevertheless, a systematic procedure for examining and updating the curriculum content would be devised in the experimental schools. This procedure should be one which will work for individual teachers or small groups of teachers, but it should also work well for examining and updating the program of the school. The procedure established should take into account the fact that there are probably many strengths in the present curriculum. Therefore, the procedures should retain the relevant and replace the irrelevant for sound and logical reasons. . . .

Following are but a few examples of questions to which the experimental schools might address themselves.

1. What content and methods are appropriate for beginning reading programs?

2. What are some effective means for overcoming the language barrier between the educationally disadvantaged child and the middle-class teacher? Both child and teacher often have considerable difficulty in understanding each other.

3. What new content can be introduced which will release the enthusiasm of the children toward learning?

4. How should the social studies program be revised? How can Negro history be integrated into the social studies program? It is quite clear that the solution is not in cutting down the quantity of the subject matter taught in United States history and world history courses, and even is not in changing the vocabulary of the textbooks. We must rather address ourselves to the question of what content, concepts, ideas, and insights in history are meaningful in the inner-city schools, and what relevance they have to the present and future lives of the children.

5. What are some effective approaches to the teaching of mathematics? What is the place of sequence? Where should computer mathematics be introduced? Geometry? Calculus?

6. Should and can all children learn a second language? Are there ways to teach and learn foreign languages which would make this opportunity available to all children?

7. What are some appropriate methods and materials for helping older

children fill in the gaps in their skill and content backgrounds, especially in language and mathematics?

The broad objective of the experimental schools is clear and simple. These schools must facilitate and accelerate the transition of the children from their position of economic and educational deprivation to a position which will enable them to compete in and contribute to the reconstruction of society. Stated another way, the experiences of school life should help children develop a capacity for and a commitment to active participation in the improvement of urban life in the United States. As pointed out earlier, the attainment of this broad objective will require the establishment of new helping relationships among the school, home, and the community. If the desired changes in the children are to be realized, concurrent changes should occur within the adults involved in and affected by the total program.

Several specific objectives rise naturally from this broad objective. Some examples are offered:

1. Competence in the essential skills of communication--reading, writing, oral expression--and in the use of quantitative concepts and symbols.

2. Increased ego-strength, self-concept, and sense of power over one's destiny among the children and also among the various individuals within the scope of the project.

3. Substantial increase in the number of children entering productive occupations and/or continuing their education as they grow into adulthood.

4. Increased communication and cooperation among the individuals involved.

5. Reduction of alienation among the various groups and individuals within the scope of the project.

6. Increased experimentation by school personnel in tackling teaching-learning problems.

7. Increased experimentation by other adults in solving problems affecting their personal lives and life in the community.

8. Reduced mobility of children coupled with the development of effective means for integrating the transient child into the school program.

9. Modification of the antisocial behavior of gangs in the community through a substantial increase in the amount of meaningful and relevant educational activities and job opportunities.

10. Substantial increase in the number of adults in the community becoming involved in learning activities to improve themselves and the life of their community.

The Elementary School Curriculum

It should be stated at the outset that the conception of curriculum for the experimental elementary school should not be "more of the same." Both the explosion of knowledge and the rapidity of change point to the need for varied learning and confirm the inability to predict what specific knowledge will be needed by children as they move to adulthood. Therefore, everyone will need to be a continuous learner to cope with his changing needs and interests in the future.

The development and application of skills (or tools) are the essential curriculum. Reading, oral and written communication, quantitative thinking and independent working skills, planning and evaluating skills, and "how-to-learn" skills must be achieved by everyone. In addition, and as one integral part of the development and application of skills, children must be helped to adapt to the process of education as it can be offered in our schools.

It should be apparent that the development and application of these processes will entail attention to the various disciplines or subject fields. But they will also entail current and "real-life" kinds of knowledge and problems. Furthermore, the development and application of process do not require that all students attend to the same subject matter content. Essential decisions about subject matter content should be made by the teachers in consultation with their students. The specific details will vary from teacher to teacher and from child to child.

Considerable work has already been done by the Woodlawn Mental Health Center with problems of adaptation at the first grade level. The work will be integrated into the curriculum of the experimental elementary school. A type of curriculum development that has been suggested by Goodlad is appropriate for consideration in the experimental elementary school.

> Thus, the early childhood phase might devote itself over a period of two or three years to the development of awareness, self-confidence, and habits of thought; a subsequent phase of three or four years to fundamental skills of speaking, reading, and writing; a later phase to significant ideas and modes of thought irrespective of subjects represented; and a still later phase to the various academic disciplines. The phases would overlap each other, so that a student might be in more than one at once, according to the irregularity of his growth, but he would miss none.(7)

The following description of the teaching-learning of reading in the experimental elementary school provides a more specific example of how a skill development area might be approached. Within any group children will have the opportunity for directed instruction, tutorial assistance, group reading activities, and individual reading sessions using a variety of materials, both in terms of content and difficulty. If the program is successful, children at all ages will be spending a great deal of time with the printed word, but most of this time each child will be reading for a specific purpose, e.g., to acquire information to solve a problem or to enjoy a story or a poem.

In order to actualize this approach, substantial changes must be made in the amount and quality of materials available and also in the number of persons on the scene to work with the children. The number of individuals can be increased by: (1) adding teacher aides (at the request of the teacher); (2) legitimizing children helping other children within the classroom and across levels and age lines; (3) using volunteers such as parents and college students; and (4) employing high school students as tutors.

At the outset, the efforts in the elementary school will be directed to the present K-6, 7-8 organization. However, the experimental district is committed to extending its concern, its resources, and its curriculum to the pre-school years, and to developing ways of influencing the environment of the child during out-of-school hours. These programs would be consciously related to the present early childhood education programs which are now operating in East Woodlawn, both within and outside the public school system.

The High School Curriculum

Attitudes, positive and negative, are basic determinants in shaping the inner-city high school environment. How teachers and administrators feel about Negro teenagers--as individuals and in terms of their capacities to learn and achieve--strongly influences the behavior of adult and parent. How a youth feels about himself, his peers, his parents, his community, his society, his heritage, and his life-chances strongly influences his behavior in school and as a learner more generally.

Negative attitudes which children possess about themselves and the school coupled with deficiences in basic educational development contribute substantially to the high dropout rate. The impact of discrimination in employment with its consequent variation in median income between whites and Negroes often obscures the increase in income available at the completion of varying levels of education. (For men, aged 25, median income for whites and non-whites with identical educational attainment levels differs immensely. In 1966, non-whites with an elementary school diploma earned $2,600; whites earned $3,700. Non-whites with a high school diploma earned $4,700; whites earned $6,700. Non-whites with a college degree earned $5,928; whites earned $9,023.)(12) As a result, commitment to remain in school on the part of many Negro youth is not strong enough to offset what appear to be appealing alternatives at the moment. Even if a youngster graduates and is accepted in a college or a university, there is a reasonable possibility that he will not be able to complete the program. Furthermore, youth who graduate from high school but who do not go on to college often face great difficulty in obtaining desirable vocational positions regardless of their academic record in school.

If high school education is to become more relevant to inner-city Negro youth, it must be able to promise some better payoff to those who enter and stay with the program. The experimental high school program should, in effect, say to freshmen: "We are here to help you make it, and we will not give up on you as long as you do not give up on us." This would mean extending the concern of the school beyond the normal four-year limit, maintaining contact with the youngsters, and working with them until they have become productive members of society and on the road toward satisfying adulthood. It would also require the development of new collaborative relationships between the experimental high school and other enterprises such as business, industry, higher and continuing education, and similar establishments. One hundred per cent success will not be possible, to be sure, but the goal is clear and should be pursued avidly.

For this goal to be pursued within the high school, the curriculum at every level should provide each youth two basic things: (1) attention, encouragement, and criticism from someone or ones who value him as a person; and (2) sustained opportunities for diverse learning experiences selected by the pupil and his "teacher-mentor." An interesting though not unprecedented idea for basic reorganization of the people and the curriculum in the high school emanates from such concerns.

For example, let us assume that an incoming freshman class at Hyde Park High School might number 600 students. This group could be divided into 15 small groups of 40 students. Two teachers could be assigned to each group--one man and one woman, assuming both boys and girls will be in each group. The two teachers should be expected to reflect, together, basic academic competency in the four major disciplines--mathematics, science, social studies, and English. That is, they would feel comfortable assisting children in those areas though they would not necessarily be specialists in all areas of study. These two "teacher-mentors" would be assigned to work with the 40 students until all had completed their in-school experience. In addition, they could continue to "pay attention" to East Woodlawn students, both those who had graduated and those who had dropped out of school.

Obviously, additional staff and resources would be necessary to satisfy the second basic need of each young person--the need for diverse learning experiences and opportunities. Arranged around these student groups in the schools would be skilled specialists, capable of assisting children individually or in learning groups of variable size. These specialists would be largely, though not exclusively, concerned with the cognitive curriculum; the "teacher-mentors" would pay special attention to the affective needs of each young person but would also do some work in the cognitive areas. Thus, there would be a weaving together, through many people, of the cognitive and affective curricula for each student. It is important to note that learning experiences for individual pupils would be determined cooperatively by the student, "teacher-mentor," and the specialist concerned.

Perhaps most of the usual high school academic courses would continue to be offered in the experimental high school. However, these courses should be taught in ways which insure the involvement of the teenagers in the learning activities. Most, if not all, students would have opportunities to participate in setting the learning agenda, selecting their learning experiences, carrying out inquiry, and evaluating their results. Content and materials available to the pupils need to be examined for their appropriateness and relevance to the abilities and interests of high school youth. Reconstructed content and new materials would be devised and tested in situations where present content and materials do not reach the student.

One overall curriculum goal will be to create a program which provides for an almost infinite variety of individual needs. Students who cannot handle basic skills or who lack elementary knowledge would be provided appropriate instruction to make up their deficiencies. On the other hand, youth who are ready for inquiry in the calculus, biological chemistry, and the works of Melville would have these opportunities available to them. This would mean supplementing the present faculty with additional professionals, volunteers, teacher aides, tutors, and paraprofessionals from the community and the University. A few advanced students might attend college classes in the University of Chicago and neighboring institutions.

In spite of such varied opportunities, some students may still be impelled by various forces to leave school before graduation. Nevertheless, the commitment of the "teacher-mentor" to these youth will continue. Through him the school would develop a school-to-work articulation program to insure that when finally detached from the school these youth would have reasonably promising employment for which they are adequately prepared. Furthermore, the "teacher-mentor" would stay with each person until he "makes it," that is, until he has found a productive spot in the world of work. (The current policy in the State of Illinois places the 18 to 21-year-old dropout in an educational no man's land. He is emotionally, physically, and socially unsuited to return to high school classes to get his diploma. He is likewise too young to be eligible for the G.E.D. certificate unless he enters military service.)

The high school should relate itself to the youth training and manpower development training programs presently being conducted in Woodlawn by The Woodlawn Organization to learn from these activities how the curriculum of the school might be altered to provide more adequately for unemployed dropouts. This knowledge also would be used to reconstruct certain aspects of the high school curriculum.

Articulation Among the Various Organizational Units

A major problem facing schools throughout the United States is the lack of continuity among the various organizational units which comprise the educational system. Children sense major disjunctions between each of the several levels through which they must pass: elementary, junior high, high, college, and adulthood. The experimental district will attempt to find ways to improve articulation among the various organizational units in the stream of schools. It will consider reorganization of the K-6, 7-8, 9-12 units into early education, middle school, upper school, and adult units. It might also arrange for children nearing the end of one unit to become involved for some of their activities in the next unit before they actually become full-fledged members of that unit. Multi-age grouping within and between units could also be tested. The district might develop a plan of teacher interchange, so that the limits of each unit become more diffuse in the eyes of the teachers. The district could also develop and test ways to enable teachers in the various units to work together on curriculum problems. This will help them sense that they are a part of the total educational system, not just a member of the unit to which they happen to be assigned.

E. SCHOOL-PARENT RELATIONSHIPS

As in every other community, Woodlawn citizens and parents are deeply interested in the education of their children. For those adults whose formal education has been limited, the school often represents a significant opportunity for children and youth to attain more from school than the preceding generation. For other adults, perhaps those who have graduated from high school or college, the schools are seen as a potentially important source of education for young men and women who will not only achieve success in a very personal sense but also provide leadership for the rebuilding of inner-city communities.

A major thrust and an indispensable element of the experimental schools is the active participation of the parents in the school and the school in the home. In a sense, parents will be encouraged to get involved in decision-making which previously they were not asked to share. Therefore, it will be necessary to develop an entirely new school-parent program. Again, the details of the program and its actual implementation must be worked out by the persons actually involved. What is presented here is merely an outline of the program structure and some examples of what may be done.

At this moment, the parent component of the experimental program is seen as having three major elements: (1) developing a helping relationship between the schools and parents; (2) assisting parents in getting in touch with appropriate community resources; and (3) locating and/or developing appropriate adult education opportunities.

Developing a Helping Relationship Between the Schools and Parents

The evidence gathered during the assessment period revealed as a major problem the lack of rapport and understanding between the parents and the school. The school-community representative, although helpful in this regard, has not succeeded in overcoming the barrier. Three reasons are advanced for this lack of success: (1) the problem is so great that one person cannot handle it; (2) the purpose of the representative was not clearly defined at the outset; and (3) as some parents began to express interest, there was no mechanism for permitting them to truly participate in decisions of consequence.

Most professional people realize that a participating relationship with parents can enhance the educational program. But the means for establishing contact with parents and subsequently involving them in decisions has not been worked out. Several community agents will probably be needed to establish contact with the parents and bring them into contact with the school. Much of this task might be accomplished by the community agent's simply being available to the parents for conversation about the educational experiences of their children which will help to clear up misunderstanding and communicate information. This could lead naturally to teacher-parent helping relationships.

The community agents should be individuals chosen from the community by The Woodlawn Organization and provided appropriate in-service training. They should not be on the payroll of the school. Parents would thus see friends, neighbors, and relatives playing productive roles as agents independent of the school administration, but maintaining contact with the school program and serving as catalytic agents whose main purpose is to bring home and school together. Once contact is established, parent participation in policy matters should be developed. A structure for such participation must be created as part of the experiment.

Properly structured parent advisory groups could be treated to encourage the expression of parents on issues. Such groups would seek actively to reduce alienation through open communications. To accomplish these goals, parent advisory groups would be established for each experimental school according to the following plan:

1. Over a period of time, candidates for the parent advisory groups would be named by parents who have been organized by the community agents. They would consist of parents who have children in the experimental schools concerned. The group should not be larger than fifteen nor smaller than seven.

2. The parent advisory groups would elect their own chairmen; would set their own agendas; and determine the time, location, and participants for the meetings.

3. In the early stages of the program, parent advisory groups might wish to make their desires known to the director of the experimental district and expect him to take these to the appropriate principal and/or teachers. As time goes on, parents will probably want to meet with the professional person directly involved with their concern.

4. The parent advisory groups would form alliances on the basis of issues. They would be free from control by the school administration and other professional personnel, but would invite these people to meet with them when appropriate.

Assisting Parents in Getting in Touch with Appropriate Community Resources

As the initial contacts which the community agents establish with parents develop into helpful relationships, evidence may indicate that some parents and families are in need of, but are not receiving services which are available or should be available to them through established agencies in the community or within the city or county. At this point the community agent would bring the family and appropriate agency into contact. The agent may have to accompany parents initially to the appropriate agency and may also find it necessary to become an advocate for some parents in the early stages of strengthening the autonomy of the home. However, the goal of helping parents develop confidence in taking the initiative will be paramount.

Locating and/or Developing Appropriate Adult Education Opportunities

The development of helping relationships between the home and the school would lead to a desire for appropriate educational opportunities for parents and other citizens. A careful survey of the adult education opportunities in Woodlawn and throughout the city has revealed that, much like the situation with regard to community services, many opportunities are available but coordination is lacking.(6)

Evidence gained from parent interviews indicates that there are a large number of parents and other adults whose needs seemingly cannot be met through existing programs or who are not aware of the opportunities available. However, the situation offers considerable promise. The former principal of the Hyde Park Evening School expressed the need for some developments and change. The supervisor of Adult Basic Literacy Programs for the Cook County Department of Public Aid indicated a readiness for more indigenous planning leading to the development of more appropriate programs. The director of the Bureau of Education Extension and the director of Adult Education, Chicago Public Schools, have already expressed an interest and willingness to work cooperatively with The Woodlawn Organization and the University of Chicago. There is little doubt that productive relationships can be established with the Chicago City College program.

As a first step, the experimental school buildings would be declared appropriate meeting places for adult activities. Teachers in the regular daytime programs who have talents particularly suited to parent needs and interests may wish to work with adults. The experimental schools will also engage a competent person to serve as a director of community education services. This individual would begin to establish a dialogue with representatives of the various adult education programs. These discussions could furnish the basis for establishing a community adult education council resulting in the coordination of efforts, and the pooling of resources, that would lead to the development of appropriate programs.

Out of these deliberations there may develop conveniently located centers where high school dropouts seeking admission to trade apprenticeships could learn mathematics, science, and language skills. In addition to the education programs that would be provided complementary services of medical and psychological care, cooperative buying, and community improvement programs could also be developed.

APPENDIX I

PARAMETERS OF AUTONOMY FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL SUB-DISTRICT

If the experimental sub-district is to be able to test out ideas and develop new procedures, considerable autonomy in operational procedures will be necessary. The following statements define the extent of the autonomy required:

A. Purpose or Focus

Opportunity to determine the focus of the district, a focus which may appear to be somewhat different than has been the case in the past.

B. Personnel and Organization

1. Freedom to reorganize the schools, to eliminate grade level structures, and to assign teachers to groups in ways which are different from those which now exist.

2. Freedom to add faculty and other persons, and to reallocate jobs; e.g., clerical tasks, use of teacher aides, volunteers, use of students as tutors.

3. Freedom to reduce personnel in some categories, if this appears essential (although at this moment we have no examples to suggest).

4. Freedom to increase the length of the teacher's day, week or school year, with appropriate compensation.

5. Freedom to vary the allocation of teachers' time devoted to teaching and to non-teaching, professional development activities.

6. Full control over the assignment and transfer of teachers and other personnel to the sub-district. Criteria and procedures for selection will be determined by the sub-district. For example, every person will be interviewed by the director of the sub-district and any other persons he might indicate, before a request for assignment is forwarded to the Woodlawn Community Board, which, in turn, is sent to the Bureau of Personnel for action.

7. Freedom to inform the teachers and administrators that any teacher who desires not to continue in the experimental sub-district will automatically be declared "supernumerary" and be placed at the top of the transfer list of any school he desires to join, and will be transferred without prejudice.

8. Freedom to create training positions within the sub-district, accepting the concommitant responsibilities for developing the dimensions of the preparation programs and for establishing entrance criteria for applicants.

9. Assurance that the Board of Examiners will certify on at least a provisional basis any teachers who are selected to work in the experimental sub-district as long as they meet the minimum requirements set up by the state of Illinois for temporary certification.

10. Freedom to determine when a child should move from one school to another, using criteria which may be different from those which are now established.

11. Freedom to decrease or increase the child's school day, week, or year, as the need for such change becomes apparent.

C. Local Community Involvement

1. Freedom to involve parents and other community groups and agencies in the school program as such involvement makes sense (such as has been done in the Woodlawn Mental Health Clinic).

2. Freedom to establish parent advisory councils for each school in the manner which has been described in a previous document.

3. Assurance that the Woodlawn Community Board will act essentially as a local board of education for the sub-district, with the understanding that as long as the policies established by the board and the operating procedures established by the director of the sub-district are within the laws of the state of Illinois, they will be accepted by the Chicago Board of Education.

D. Financial Support

1. Assurance that the normal funding for the schools will be provided by the Chicago Board of Education, and that all additional funds secured for the sub-district will be placed in a special fund and expended at the request of the Director as approved by the Woodlawn Community Board.

2. Freedom to search for funds to support the programs of the sub-district from any agency or foundation which might respond to requests.

3. Freedom to expend additional resources which become available to the experimental sub-district in ways which are determined by the sub-district.

4. Freedom to use the purchasing power of the Chicago Board of Education to provide supplies and equipment to the experimental sub-district, but also the freedom to go outside to purchase those items which are needed immediately or those which cannot be secured through normal channels.

E. Research and Evaluation

Freedom to insure the presence of the necessary research personnel in the sub-district schools, both by infusing them from external sources (such as the University of Chicago), and by developing the research and evaluation capacities of people already in the schools. This will be necessary to evaluate the programs which are established.

F. Length of Agreement

The experimental sub-district will be established for a period of not less than three years, preferably five years.

APPENDIX J

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

(First Draft-10/3/67)

The creation of an experimental district in Woodlawn offers to the Chicago Public Schools, The Woodlawn Organization, and the University of Chicago great opportunity to test out creative imagination in a disciplined situation. The commitment of the three collaborating institutions to finding a way to provide education of high quality in an inner-city segregated community is sincere and intense. It represents a readiness and willingness on the part of each institution to commit time, resources, and other energies to the fulfillment of this hope.

In order that this opportunity can be realized, The Woodlawn Organization commits itself to full participation in the effort and to continual expenditure of time and resources in attempting to involve parents and other grass roots community persons in the programs of the school. The University of Chicago is committed to participating in the planning, study, and evaluation of the processes undertaken as well as to the recruitment and training of personnel who are to become involved in the experimental district.

Finally, the Chicago Public Schools provides opportunities to the experimental district to test out ideas and develop new procedures which in turn may eventually become common practice in other inner-city schools both in Woodlawn and elsewhere. In order that this opportunity may be realized, the Chicago Public Schools extends autonomy, in addition to that which already exists, to the experimental district in the following areas:

A. Purpose: Opportunity to determine the experimental focus for the district.

B. Personnel and Organization: Opportunity to examine the current personnel and organizational policies existing in the Chicago Public Schools and to develop and test out new ideas concerning these. In order that such will be possible, the experimental district will have the opportunity to:

1. Cooperatively review the impending assignment of and make recommendations for the transfer of teachers and other personnel to the experimental district under criteria developed by the experimental district.

2. Once the focus of the experimental district has been clarified, teachers and administrators of the schools selected as well as those in other East Woodlawn schools will be given the opportunity to express an interest in being a part of the program. If there are teachers and/or administrators in the selected schools who would rather not be

involved, they may request and will be granted transfer from their school without prejudice in accordance with the usual supernumerary practices of the Chicago Board of Education.

3. Examine the current task assignments and workloads of the various positions in the schools and create and test out new plans for the completion of these tasks. This might include the creation of new positions, recruitment and training of persons for these positions, and the elimination of some positions and/or tasks.

4. Lengthen the teacher's day, week, or school year, with appropriate compensation. Such changes might also affect the children's day, week, or school year.

C. Curriculum: Opportunity to examine the current curricular practices and to create and test out new programs of study and new teaching-learning approaches in all curricular areas.

D. Financial Support: It is understood that the per-pupil expenditure in the experimental district will, of necessity, be considerably above that which is now being spent per child in the City of Chicago. This extra money needed for the experimental district will have to come from outside government or private sources. Therefore, in addition to the normal funding which the schools will receive from the Board of Education, the experimental district will have the opportunity to:

1. Search for additional funds to support the programs from government agencies or foundations.

2. Expend the additional resources which become available to the experimental district in ways which are determined by the district. This includes present and future differential funding which comes to the city schools as a matter of practice (e.g., Title I and Title II funds of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965).

E. Location: The Woodlawn Community Board will have the opportunity to determine the general location of the offices for the experimental district.

F. Further Negotiations: As the need for additional opportunities for autonomy becomes evident, the experimental district is invited to present these needs to the General Superintendent of Schools for negotiation.

G. Length of Agreement: In order that the experimental district will have sufficient time to realize its goals, the district will be established for a period of not less than three years, preferably five.

APPENDIX K

BOARD OF EDUCATION REPORT #67-1214

(12/13/67)

Approve Memorandum of Agreement For Experimental Urban Education Developmental Project in District 14; Approve Request for Title III Grant

To the Board of Education of the City of Chicago:

The General Superintendent of Schools

Reports that Board Report 67-267-4 adopted March 8, 1967, outlined briefly an experimental developmental study project carried on by the University of Chicago in cooperation with the Chicago Public Schools and The Woodlawn Organization. This report outlined the major objectives of the planners during the developmental period of March 15, 1967, through November 15, 1967, as "(a) the determination of how the participating institutions and organizations can most appropriately and effectively work together for the improvement of public education in the central city; and (b) the development of recommendations for an operational plan for such collaborative effort." The focus of the initial inquiry was in the East Woodlawn section of District 14 of the Chicago Public Schools.

That Board Report 67-267-4 further stipulated that "planners affiliated with the project will design new mechanisms and programs for educational research, development, demonstration, dissemination, and training, all viewed in the context of practice in regular public schools in Chicago. Certain basic design suggestions already advanced will be tested for feasibility during the developmental period. Particular emphasis will be placed on the study of the potentiality (a) of designating District 14 as an experimental district; (b) of creating a Title III (Public Law 89-10) educational center for the experimental district; (c) of designating specific mainstream schools in the experimental district as demonstration schools; and (d) of developing an experimental elementary-secondary center for the experimental district."

That Board Report 67-267-4 further stipulated that "it is anticipated that the activity of the developmental period itself (to include the cooperative effort of a major urban public school system, a growing and nationally respected community organization, and a major urban university) and the operational plan recommended will provide a model for similar and subsequent action in large and small urban centers of the United States."

And Further

Reports that a tri-partite organization called the Woodlawn Community Board consisting of representatives from the University of Chicago, District 14 of the Chicago Public Schools, and The Woodlawn Organization was organized to formulate policy in line with the objectives noted above.

That a small staff representing the University of Chicago, the Chicago Public Schools, and The Woodlawn Organization has been at work during the period noted above gathering data and preparing a preliminary proposal entitled "Urban Education Developmental Project" for the schools in East Woodlawn of District 14.

And Further

Reports that it has been determined that there should be modification of the basic design suggestions listed above to the effect that (a) only the East Woodlawn schools in District 14, to be known as the Woodlawn Experimental District, will be designated as experimental schools in the project; these consist of Carnegie, Dumas, Fermi, Fermi Upper Grade Center, Fiske, Scott, 61st and University, Tesla, Wadsworth, Wadsworth Upper Grade Center, and Hyde Park High School; (b) it does not appear feasible at this time to create an educational center for experimental purposes but that experimentation be carried out within the existing school settings; (c) intense experimentation will, at first, be carried out in one or two K-6 schools listed above, one UGC, and Hyde Park High School; (d) it does not appear feasible at this time to develop an experimental elementary-secondary center.

And Further

Reports that a Memorandum of Agreement attached herewith has been developed by the Project staff and agreed to by members of the Woodlawn Community Board.

And Further

Reports that Staff has reviewed this Memorandum of Agreement and recommends its approval.

The General Superintendent of Schools Therefore

Recommends that the Memorandum of Agreement be approved by the Board of Education and that the President and Secretary be authorized to execute same on behalf of the Board of Education.

And Further

Recommends that the Board of Education approve the intention of the Project staff to seek approval and funds for a PL 89-10 Title III Grant to carry out the Urban Education Developmental Project proposal.

Financial: No expense to the Board of Education.

Prepared by: Curtis C. Melnick Area Associate Superintendent	Respectfully submitted, James F. Redmond General Superintendent of Schools

Approved by:
Evelyn F. Carlson
Associate Superintendent

Eileen C. Stack
Associate Superintendent

Noted:
Robert Stickles
Controller

December 13, 1967

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT AMONG THE CHICAGO BOARD OF EDUCATION, THE WOODLAWN ORGANIZATION, AND THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

(Second Draft-11/3/67)

Introduction and General Conditions of the Agreement

The creation of an experimental district in East Woodlawn offers to the Chicago Public Schools, The Woodlawn Organization, and the University of Chicago an opportunity to test out an imaginative plan in urban education. The commitment of the three collaborating institutions to finding a way to provide education of high quality in an inner-city segregated community represents a readiness and willingness on the part of each institution to commit time, energy, and resources to the fulfillment of this hope.

In order that this opportunity can be realized, The Woodlawn Organization agrees to participate in the effort and to commit time and resources in attempting to involve parents and other grass roots community persons in the programs of the school. The University of Chicago agrees to participate in the planning, study, and evaluation of the processes undertaken as well as to assist in the recruitment and training of personnel who are involved in the experimental district. The Chicago Board of Education agrees to establish the experimental district and to provide schools in which ideas may be tested and new procedures developed.

Creation of the Experimental District

Upon the adoption of the foregoing proposal and this Memorandum of Agreement by the appropriate bodies of the Chicago Public Schools, The Woodlawn Organization, and the University of Chicago, there will be established a stream of schools in East Woodlawn to be known as the Woodlawn Experimental District. The district will be administered in accordance with the Tripartite Collaborative Plan. This designation of schools may take place progressively and may be changed when and if the conditions of the experiment or other impelling conditions develop to warrant such change. If change becomes necessary, it will be made only after consultation with the Woodlawn Community Board.

As described in the proposal, the director of the experimental district will be employed by the Board of Education upon the recommendation of the Woodlawn Community Board and the General Superintendent of Schools. While responsible to the General Superintendent of Schools, he will be responsive to the Woodlawn Community Board. The organization and personnel of the Woodlawn Community Board are described elsewhere.

Special Operating Considerations Extended to the Experimental District

In addition to the autonomy usually granted to individual schools in Chicago, the Board of Education for the purposes of the experiment agrees to extend additional autonomy as outlined below to the experimental district.

1. The experimental district and the Bureau of Personnel jointly will reach agreement on decisions concerning the assignment and/or transfer of teachers and other personnel to the experimental district.

2. The initial two or three months of the project in each school will be devoted to meetings with school personnel to share with them the purposes of the experimental district and to enable them to participate in determining specific programmatic dimensions designed to achieve these purposes. When the purposes and program dimensions have been determined through this involvement and the personnel needs have been established, faculty members in the school will be invited to express an interest in continuing as members of the faculty. To the extent possible, persons expressing an interest will be invited into the program. Others will be granted transfer from their school without prejudice.

3. The experimental district will have the opportunity to determine the types of positions needed (teacher, administrative, clerical, and other) and the freedom to fill these positions with the most suitable people obtainable.

4. Within the stipulations set up by the State of Illinois for state

aid purposes, the experimental district will have the option of determining such matters as length of term and length of school day. To the extent that these decisions require adjustment for teachers, appropriate compensation will be provided.

5. The experimental district will have the opportunity to establish the curriculum and create and test out new programs of study and new teaching-learning approaches in the experimental schools.

6. It is expected that the additional revenues needed for the experimental district will come from government (state and federal) and/or private sources. Therefore, in addition to the normal funding which the schools will receive from the Board of Education, the experimental district is granted permission:

   a. To seek additional funds to support the programs from governmental agencies or foundations.

   b. To expend the additional resources which become available to the experimental district in ways which are determined by the district for the purposes of the experiment. This includes present and future federal funds which come to the city schools as a matter of practice (e.g., Title I and Title II funds of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and funds that might be made available through Title III).

7. The Woodlawn Community Board will have the opportunity to recommend the general location of the offices for the Woodlawn Experimental District.

Opportunities for Review and Revision of This Agreement

As the Woodlawn Experimental District becomes operational the agreements stipulated herein may require review and/or revision. In order that this can be accomplished, it is understood that any one of the three collaborating institutions has the right to ask for a review.

APPENDIX L

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT AMONG THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO, THE WOODLAWN ORGANIZATION, AND THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

(Third Draft-12/14/67)

Introduction and General Conditions of the Agreement

The creation of an experimental district in East Woodlawn offers to the Chicago Public Schools, The Woodlawn Organization, and the University of Chicago an opportunity to test out an imaginative plan in urban education. The commitment of the three collaborating institutions to finding a way to provide education of high quality in an inner-city segregated community represents a readiness and willingness on the part of each institution to commit time, energy, and resources to the fulfillment of this hope.

In order that this opportunity can be realized, The Woodlawn Organization agrees to participate in the effort and to commit time and resources in attempting to involve parents and other grass roots community persons in the programs of the school. The University of Chicago agrees to participate in the planning, study, and evaluation of the processes undertaken as well as to assist in the recruitment and training of personnel who are involved in the experimental district. The Board of Education of the City of Chicago agrees to establish the experimental district and to provide schools in which ideas may be tested and new procedures developed.

Creation of the Experimental District

Upon the adoption of this Memorandum of Agreement by the Board of Education, The Woodlawn Organization, and the University of Chicago, there will be established a stream of schools in East Woodlawn to be known as the Woodlawn Experimental District. The district will be administered in accordance with the Tripartite Collaborative Plan, which appears on page 8 of Appendix G. This designation of schools may take place progressively and may be changed when and if the conditions of the experiment or other impelling conditions develop to warrant such change. If change becomes necessary, it will be made only after consultation with the Woodlawn Community Board and upon approval of the Board of Education.

As described in the proposal, the director of the experimental district will be employed by the Board of Education upon the recommendation of the General Superintendent of Schools, who will make this recommendation after consultation with the Woodlawn Community Board. While responsible to the General Superintendent of Schools, the director of the experimental district will bring proposals for experimentation to the Woodlawn Community Board to receive its reactions, recommendations and approval. The organization and personnel of the Woodlawn Community Board are described in Appendix O.

Special Operating Considerations Extended to the Experimental District

In addition to the autonomy usually granted to individual schools in Chicago, the Board of Education agrees to extend additional autonomy as outlined below to the experimental district.

1. The Bureau of Personnel of the Board of Education will seek the recommendation of the director of the experimental district on the assignment and/or transfer of teachers and other personnel to the experimental district.

2. The initial two or three months of the Project in each school will be devoted to meetings by the director of the experimental district with school personnel to share with them the purposes of the experimental district and to enable them to participate in determining specific programmatic dimensions designed to achieve these purposes. When the purposes and program dimensions have been determined through this involvement and the personnel needs have been established, faculty members in the school will be invited to express an interest in continuing as members of the faculty. To the extent possible, other persons expressing an interest in the experiment will be invited into the program.

3. The director of the experimental district will have the opportunity to recommend to the General Superintendent of Schools and the Board of Education the types and numbers of positions needed (teacher, administrative, clerical and other) so as to fill these positions with the most suitable people obtainable.

4. The director of the experimental district may recommend to the General Superintendent of Schools and the Board of Education such matters as length of term and length of school day where desirable to further the purposes of the experiment.

5. The director of the experimental district will recommend to the General Superintendent of Schools and the Board of Education innovations in curriculum, new programs of study, and new teaching-learning approaches to be tested in the experimental schools.

6. It is expected that the additional revenues needed for the experimental district will come from government (state and federal) and/or private sources. Therefore, in addition to the normal funding which the schools will receive from the Board of Education, the director of the experimental district is granted permission:

    a. To seek additional funds to support the programs from governmental agencies or foundations.

    b. To expend, with the approval of the General Superintendent of Schools and the Board of Education, the additional resources which become available to the experimental district in ways which further the purposes of the experiment.

7. The Woodlawn Community Board will have the opportunity to recommend the general location of the offices for the Woodlawn Experimental District.

Opportunities for Review and Revision of This Agreement

As the Woodlawn Experimental District becomes operational, the agreements stipulated herein may require review and/or revision. In order that this can be accomplished, it is understood that any one of the three collaborating institutions has the right to ask for a review.

This Agreement is to be construed in accordance with the laws of the State of Illinois.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the University of Chicago, The Woodlawn Organization, and the Board of Education of the City of Chicago have caused these presents to be executed by their respective presidents and secretaries and have impressed their seal hereon, this _____day of ______________, A.D., 1967.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

SEAL

By______________________________
President

Attest:______________________________
Secretary of the Board of Trustees

THE WOODLAWN ORGANIZATION, an Illinois not-for-profit corporation

SEAL

By______________________________
President

Attest:______________________________
Secretary

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO, a body politic and corporate

SEAL

By______________________________
President

Attest:______________________________
Secretary

Board:________________

Approved as to Legal Form:

____
Attorney for the Board of Education of the City of Chicago

Noted:

____
Controller

APPENDIX M

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT AMONG THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO, THE WOODLAWN ORGANIZATION, AND THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

(Fourth Draft-12/18/67)

Creation of the Experimental District

Upon the adoption of this Memorandum of Agreement by the Board of Education, The Woodlawn Organization, and the University of Chicago, there will be established a stream of schools in East Woodlawn to be known as the Woodlawn Experimental District. The district will be administered in accordance with the Tripartite Collaborative Plan which appears on page 8 of Appendix G.

The Tripartite Collaborative Plan insures the involvement of The Woodlawn Organization and the University of Chicago in this experiment to improve urban public education by requiring the concurrence of the Woodlawn Community Board in all actions taken to further the purposes of the experiment. The organization, procedures, and personnel of the Woodlawn Community Board are described in Appendix O.

The following specific operating examples are stated to establish the tone and intent of this agreement:

1. The designation of the stream of schools to be used for experimentation will be made by the General Superintendent of Schools and the Board of Education with the concurrence of the Woodlawn Community Board. If change in this designation becomes necessary it will be made with the concurrence of the Woodlawn Community Board and upon approval of the Board of Education.

2. The director of the experimental district will be employed by the Board of Education upon the recommendation of the General Superintendent of Schools. This recommendation will have the concurrence of the Woodlawn Community Board.

3. The initial two or three months of the project in each school will be devoted to meetings by the director of the experimental district with school personnel to share with them the purposes of the experimental district and to enable them to participate in determining specific programmatic dimensions designed to achieve these purposes. When the purpose and program dimensions have been determined through this involvement and the personnel needs have been established, faculty members in the school will be invited to express an interest in continuing as members of the faculty. Those who do not wish to remain will be granted transfer to another school without prejudice.

4. The Bureau of Personnel of the Board of Education will seek the

concurrence of the director of the experimental district before assigning to and/or transferring from the experimental district teachers and other personnel.

5. While responsible to the General Superintendent of Schools, the director of the experimental district must bring proposals for experimentation to the Woodlawn Community Board to receive its reactions, recommendations, and approval.

6. After receiving the concurrence of the Woodlawn Community Board, the director of the experimental district will recommend to the General Superintendent and the Board of Education such matters as:

a. The types and numbers of positions needed (teacher, administrative, clerical, and other) so as to fill these positions with the most suitable people obtainable.

b. Length of term and length of school day where desirable to further the purposes of the experiment.

c. Innovations in curriculum, new programs of study, and new teaching-learning approaches to be tested in the experimental schools.

7. It is expected that the additional revenues needed for the experimental district will come from government (state and federal) and/or private sources. Therefore, in addition to the normal funding which the schools will receive from the Board of Education, the director of the experimental district is granted permission:

a. To seek additional funds to support the programs from governmental agencies or foundations.

b. To expend, with the approval of the Woodlawn Community Board, the General Superintendent of Schools, and the Board of Education, the additional resources which become available to the experimental district in ways which further the purposes of the experiment.

8. The location of the offices for the Woodlawn Experimental District will have the concurrence of the Woodlawn Community Board.

Opportunities for Review and Revision of This Agreement

As the Woodlawn Experimental District becomes operational the agreements stipulated herein may require review and/or revision. In order that this can be accomplished, it is understood that any one of the three collaborating institutions has the right to ask for a review. Any changes rising out of this review must have the concurrence of the Woodlawn Community Board.

APPENDIX N

BOARD OF EDUCATION REPORT #67-1214 (AMENDED)

(12/27/67)

Approve Memorandum of Agreement For Experimental Urban Education Developmental Project in District 14; Approve Request for Title III Grant

To the Board of Education of the City of Chicago:

The General Superintendent of Schools

Reports that Board Report 67-267-4 adopted March 8, 1967, outlined briefly an experimental developmental study project carried on by the University of Chicago in cooperation with the Chicago Public Schools and The Woodlawn Organization. This report outlined the major objectives of the planners during the developmental period of March 15, 1967, through November 15, 1967, as "(a) the determination of how the participating institutions and organizations can most appropriately and effectively work together for the improvement of public education in the central city; and (b) the development of recommendations for an operational plan for such collaborative effort." The focus of the initial inquiry was in the East Woodlawn section of District 14 of the Chicago Public Schools.

That Board Report 67-267-4 further stipulated that "planners affiliated with the project will design new mechanisms and programs for educational research, development, demonstration, dissemination, and training, all viewed in the context of practice in regular public schools in Chicago. Certain basic design suggestions already advanced will be tested for feasibility during the developmental period. Particular emphasis will be placed on the study of the potentiality (a) of designating District 14 as an experimental district; (b) of creating a Title III (Public Law 89-10) educational center for the experimental district; (c) of designating specific mainstream schools in the experimental district as demonstration schools; and (d) of developing an experimental elementary-secondary center for the experimental district."

That Board Report 67-267-4 further stipulated that "it is anticipated that the activity of the developmental period itself (to include the cooperative effort of a major urban public school system, a growing and nationally respected community organization, and a major urban university) and the operational plan recommended will provide a model for similar and subsequent action in large and small urban centers of the United States."

And Further

Reports that a tri-partite organization called the Woodlawn Community Board consisting of representatives from the University of Chicago, District 14 of the Chicago Public Schools, and The Woodlawn Organization was organized to formulate policy in line with the objectives noted above.

That a small staff representing the University of Chicago, the Chicago Public Schools, and The Woodlawn Organization has been at work during the period noted above gathering data and preparing a preliminary proposal entitled "Urban Education Developmental Project" for the schools in East Woodlawn District 14.

And Further

Reports that it has been determined that there should be modification of the basic design suggestions listed above to the effect that (a) only the East Woodlawn schools in District 14, to be known as the Woodlawn Experimental District, will be designated as experimental schools in the project; these consist of Carnegie, Dumas, Fermi, Fermi Upper Grade Center, Fiske, Scott, 61st and University, Tesla, Wadsworth, Wadsworth Upper Grade Center, and Hyde Park High School; (b) it does not appear feasible at this time to create an educational center for experimental purposes but that experimentation be carried out within the existing school settings; (c) intense experimentation will, at first, be carried out in one or two K-6 schools listed above, one UGC, and Hyde Park High School; (d) it does not appear feasible at this time to develop an experimental elementary-secondary center.

And Further

Reports that a Memorandum of Agreement (attached hereto) has been developed by the Project staff and agreed to by members of the Woodlawn Community Board.

And Further

Reports that staff has reviewed this Memorandum of Agreement and recommends its approval.

The General Superintendent of Schools Therefore

Recommends that the Memorandum of Agreement be approved by the Board of Education and that the President and Secretary be authorized to execute same on behalf of the Board of Education.

And Further

Recommends that the Board of Education approve the proposal presented in another Board Report for a PL 89-10 Title III Grant which will provide funds to initiate this experimental district.

Financial: No expense to the Board.

Prepared by: Curtis C. Melnick Area Associate Superintendent	Respectfully submitted, James F. Redmond General Superintendent of Schools

Approved by:
Evelyn F. Carlson
Eileen C. Stack
Associate Superintendents

Noted:
Robert Stickles
Controller

December 27, 1967

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT AMONG THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO, THE WOODLAWN ORGANIZATION, AND THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

(Final Draft-12/27/67)

This agreement, made this 27th day of December, A. D., 1967, by and among the Board of Education of the City of Chicago, a body politic and corporate, the University of Chicago, an Illinois not-for-profit corporation, and The Woodlawn Organization, an Illinois not-for-profit corporation.

Witnesseth, that:

Whereas the creation by the Board of Education of an experimental school district in the Woodlawn area of the City of Chicago offers to the Board of Education, The Woodlawn Organization, and the University of Chicago an opportunity to test an imaginative plan in urban education; and the commitment of the three collaborating institutions to finding a way to provide education of high quality in an inner-city community represents a readiness and willingness on the part of each institution to commit time, energy and resources to the fulfillment of this hope.

Now, therefore, in order that this opportunity can be realized, The Woodlawn Organization agrees to participate in the experiment and to commit time and resources in attempting to involve parent and other grass roots community persons in the programs of the experiment; the University of Chicago agrees to participate in the planning, study and evaluation of the experiment and to assist in the recruitment and training of personnel who are to be involved in the experimental district; and the Board of Education agrees to establish the experimental district and to provide schools in which ideas may be tested and new procedures developed.

The parties further agree as follows:

1. Each party hereto will assign seven persons, representing a cross-section of its institution, who will form the Woodlawn Community Board. The purposes of the Woodlawn Community Board are, among other things, to (a) review, discuss, initiate and recommend policies and projects in urban education that will directly affect the children, adults, community and community organizations of the Woodlawn area, and (b) provide a channel of communication with the institutions represented on the Woodlawn Community Board. The Woodlawn Community Board may make such rules for its administration and operation as it deems desirable that are consistent with the purposes of the experiment and of this agreement.

2. The Board of Education will designate the particular schools that are to be included in the experimental district. The schools forming the experimental district may be changed from time to time by the Board of Education. The Board of Education agrees that it will seek the advice and consultation of the Woodlawn Community Board before designating or changing the schools in the experimental district.

3. The Board of Education will appoint the director of the experimental district upon the recommendation of the General Superintendent of Schools. The General Superintendent of Schools will make this recommendation after consultation with the Woodlawn Community Board. The director of the experimental district will be responsible to the General Superintendent of Schools and the Board of Education but he will bring proposals for experimentation to the Woodlawn Community Board to receive its reactions, recommendations and approval.

4. The Board of Education recognizes the Woodlawn Community Board as the body that insures the involvement and participation of The Woodlawn Organization and the people and agencies it represents, and the University of Chicago, in this experiment. The Board of Education solicits the participation of the Woodlawn Community Board in all matters related to the personnel, organization, program and administration of the experimental district. The Board of Education agrees that the director of the experimental district is required to obtain the advice, counsel, recommendations and concurrence of the Woodlawn Community Board prior to making any recommendations related to the personnel, organization, programming, administration, finance or any other matters concerning the experiment, to the General Superintendent of Schools and the Board of Education. The action taken by the Woodlawn Community Board on these matters will be indicated in any recommendations that the director of the experimental district submits to the General Superintendent of Schools. If the director's proposed recommendation is not in agreement with the Woodlawn Community Board's recommendation, the director of the experi-

mental district will make a report and will so indicate. The concurrence, or lack of it, of the Woodlawn Community Board will not bind the General Superintendent of Schools in directing the performance of this experiment or of making any recommendations to the Board of Education; nor does it in any way affect the right of the Board of Education to grant or deny approval to any recommendations of the General Superintendent of Schools in this regard or to initiate, change or terminate any part of the performance of this experiment. The Board of Education will give full consideration to the decisions and recommendations of the director of the experimental district and the Woodlawn Community Board, but nothing in this agreement will be construed to limit the authority of the Board of Education to control and manage the schools in the experimental district in accordance with the administrative and decision-making powers of the Board of Education contained in the laws of the State of Illinois.

5. The initial two or three months of the project in each school will be devoted, among other things, to meetings by the director of the experimental district with school personnel to share with them the purposes of the experiment and to enable them to participate in determining specific programmatic dimensions designed to achieve these purposes. When the purposes and program dimensions have been determined through this involvement and the personnel needs have been established, faculty members in the school will be invited to express an interest in continuing as members of the faculty. To the extent possible, other persons expressing an interest in the experiment will be invited into the program.

6. The Woodlawn Community Board will have the opportunity to recommend the general location of the offices for the experimental district.

7. As the experiment becomes operational this agreement may require revision. In order that this can be accomplished, it is understood that any one of the three collaborating institutions has the right to ask for a review.

8. This agreement is to be construed in accordance with the laws of the State of Illinois.

In witness whereof, the University of Chicago, The Woodlawn Organization, and the Board of Education of the City of Chicago have caused these presents to be executed by their respective presidents and secretaries and have impressed their seals hereon, this 27th day of December, A. D., 1967.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

By ______________________________
George W. Beadle, President

SEAL

Attest: ______________________________
Walter V. Leen, Secretary of the
Board of Trustees

THE WOODLAWN ORGANIZATION

SEAL

By ______________________________
Arthur M. Brazier, President

Attest: ______________________________
Eula Mae Anderson, Secretary

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO

SEAL

By ______________________________
James M. Whiston, President

Attest: ______________________________
M. Q. Collins, Secretary

BOARD: 67-1214 (12/27/67)

Approved as to Legal Form:	Noted:
James W. Coffey, Attorney for the Board of Education of the City of Chicago	Robert Stickles, Controller

7322

APPENDIX O

WOODLAWN COMMUNITY BOARD FOR URBAN EDUCATION PROJECTS

(12/27/67)

1. Preamble and Purposes

1.1 Whereas the Chicago Public Schools, The Woodlawn Organization, and the University of Chicago are concerned with education in urban settings; and

1.2 Whereas the mutual goal of these three institutions is to establish urban education projects which may include (a) experimental and demonstration schools as well as (b) a variety of research, training, development, demonstration, and dissemination projects; and

1.3 Whereas the initial and intensive efforts of the urban education projects will be focussed in the East Woodlawn community which is located in District 14 of the Chicago Public Schools; and

1.4 Whereas in projects in urban education which directly affect the children, adults, community or community organization of Woodlawn, the three institutions essential to planning and implementation are (a) the Chicago Public Schools, (b) The Woodlawn Organization, and (c) the University of Chicago; and

1.5 Whereas these three institutions and the members thereof are broadly representative of the cultural and educational resources of the area designated as the experimental district in East Woodlawn;

1.6 Therefore, a Woodlawn Community Board for Urban Education Projects has been established. Its primary functions are (a) to review, discuss (and in some cases initiate) and prepare recommendations for policies and projects in urban education which will directly affect the children, adults, community or community organization of Woodlawn and (b) to provide a channel of communication between the projects and the larger institutions represented on the Woodlawn Community Board. It is recognized that under the provisions of the Illinois School Code, final decisions regarding said policies and projects must be made by the Board of Education, City of Chicago.

2. Organization

2.1 The Board consists of seven representatives each from the Chicago Public Schools, The Woodlawn Organization, and the University of

Chicago. Members are selected by each participating institution in a manner designated by the institution. The delegation from each institution should be selected to represent a cross-section of that institution. For example, the Chicago Public Schools delegation might include representatives from the central administration, the district office, principals, teachers, and other staff members; the University of Chicago delegation should be cross-disciplinary; The Woodlawn Organization delegation should be broadly representative of the organization and the community.

2.2 Each delegation elects a chairman. Each chairman presides for four consecutive regular meetings prior to turning over the gavel to the next chairman.

3. Meetings

3.1 Regular meetings of the Board are held monthly, with the option of special meetings. The directors of the urban education projects in Woodlawn will, in consultation with the three chairmen, prepare the agenda for each meeting of the Board.

3.2 The regular meetings of the Woodlawn Community Board may be open to observers who desire to come for information. In order to provide opportunities for members of the Woodlawn community to participate, a sub-committee of the Woodlawn Community Board may hold open meetings to receive criticisms, complaints, and suggestions. The entire Woodlawn Community Board may occasionally hold open hearings on important matters prior to reaching a decision.

4. Procedures

4.1 Decisions on recommendations which the Woodlawn Community Board will make to the Board of Education must have concurrent approval of the delegations of the institutions represented. Ordinarily, decisions are reached through open voting by the assembled Board members. When a Board member requests, institutional delegations may caucus to determine their positions before voting. When the caucus is called, the chairman of each delegation presides over his respective delegation during the caucus session and casts a single vote.

4.2 Whenever feasible, the Woodlawn Community Board will recommend that specific programs in urban education be conducted under the auspices of and through the structure of existing institutions in the community.

5. Jurisdiction

5.1 Recommendations for programs and projects in urban education may emanate from any source within the community and the component institutions. In each case a proposed program which would directly affect the Woodlawn community will be reviewed by the Woodlawn Community Board prior to submission to the Board of Education.

5.2 The activities of the Early Education Research Center, which has been funded as part of a National Laboratory in Early Childhood Education, fall under the jurisdiction of the Woodlawn Community Board whenever policies and programs of the Center directly affect the Woodlawn community.

5.3 The Woodlawn Community Board has been established to facilitate occasional but necessary direct communication from any community group or citizen, or university researcher, or public school teacher (as examples) to the Board itself. The Woodlawn Community Board is responsible for designing methods for such direct access.

APPENDIX P

INTERVIEW SCHEDULES USED IN THE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

Student (Grades 6, 7, 8, 9)

Instructions: Let the student finish his statements; give him time; allow pauses. Use only the probes listed. If no probe is listed and there is no response, use "think about it a little" or repeat the question. You can also use "anything else?" Group interviews: rotate the sequence of answers for each question.

1. How old are you?
2. What grade are you in?
3. How long have you attended this school?
4. What is school for? (Probe: Why should you come to school?)
5. What do you do in school?
6. What do you like best of the things you do in school? Why?
7. What do you like least of the things you do in school? Why?
8. How do you feel about the way you are treated in school?
9. What are some of the things you cannot do in school that you would like to do? (Probe: Can you think of anything else?) (High School Students)
10. Tell me about a child that you like best in your room.
11. Tell me about a child that you don't like.
12. What do you like about your teacher(s)? (Probe: Anything else?)
13. What do you dislike about your teacher(s)? (Probe: Anything else?)
14. Do you ever take books home? Which books do you take home? Why do you take them home?
15. What are some of the things you have learned outside of school? From whom did you learn these things?
16. If you didn't have to come to school, what would you do during the day with the time you would have? (Probe: What else?)
17. What do you want to do when you are older? Why do you want to do this? How do you plan to get there? What do you think your chances are of getting there?
18. If you were the principal of this school, how would you change it? (Probe: Anything else?)
19. If you were the teacher of your class, how would you change it? (Probe: Anything else?)
20. What other things do you think we ought to know about the school which would help us find ways to improve your school?

Teacher

Instructions: Use only the probes listed. If no probe is listed and there is no response, use "think about it a little" or repeat the question.

1. How long have you been teaching in the Chicago schools?
2. How long have you been in your present school?
3. What is your present assignment? (Items 1, 2, and 3 are warm-up questions. Data are not important.)
4. What are some of the problems you encounter in your daily work? (Probe: Can you think of anything else? Jot down for later recall.)
   a. Why do you think this problem exists?
   b. Have you received any help in attempting to solve this problem? If so, where did this help come from? How specifically did it help? (Probe: Can you think of anything else?)
   c. What additional resources would you like to have to solve this problem? How would you use these resources? (Probe: Can you think of anything else?)
5. Of the problems you have mentioned, what three do you feel are the most critical? (Review problems for interviewee.)
6. What do you like about this school? (Probe: Can you think of anything else?)
7. Other than the problems you mentioned, what do you dislike about this school? (Probe: Can you think of anything else?)
8. If you were the principal, what changes would you make or what add tional resources would you ask for? How would you use these resources?
9. Describe a child in your room who is particularly easy to work with.
10. Are you able to do everything for this child that you would like to do? What additional things would you like to be able to do for him?
11. Describe a child in your room who is particularly difficult to work with.
12. What are you able to do to help this child? What additional things would you like to be able to do for him?
13. Are there any special projects going on in your classroom? If so, describe them. (Probe: Board of Education projects, such as curriculum; university projects; community projects; parent projects; other.)
14. What contributions, if any, do these projects make in helping you deal with your problems? Could they be altered to be of more assistance? If so, how?
15. What other things come to mind that we haven't mentioned which you feel ought to be considered by the project staff? What other questions do you think I might have asked you?
16. If you think of other things after I leave, please do not hesitate to call me at MI. 3-0800, extension 3741. (Present interviewee with printed card.)

Principal

1. Would you describe your school to me? (This is a warm-up question; data are not important.)
2. Tell me about some of the programs in your school that you are particularly pleased with. (Again, this is a warm-up question, designed to set a positive tone.)
3. What are some of your persistent problems? (Ask questions a., b., c., d., if not included in response.)
   a. Why do you think this problem exists?
   b. What are some of the things you have tried to do about it?
   c. Have you received any help in solving this problem? If so, where did this help come from: How specifically did it help?
   d. What kinds of help would you like to have to solve this problem? How would you use this help?
4. What do you think are your three most critical problems?
5. Describe some of the teachers who are particularly effective in your school.
   a. Are you able to do what you would like to do for these teachers?
   b. What are some of the additional things you would like to be able to do for them?
6. Describe some of the teachers who are particularly ineffective in your school.
   a. What have you tried to do to help these teachers become more effective?
   b. What are some of the additional things you would like to be able to do for these teachers?
7. Describe some of the children in your school who are particularly easy to work with.
   a. Are you able to do what you would like to do for them?
   b. What additional things would you like to be able to do for them?
8. Describe some of the children in your school who are particularly difficult to work with.
   a. What are you able to do to help these children?
   b. What additional things would you like to be able to do for them?
9. If you had complete control of this school and all the resources you need, how would you change this school?
10. Are there any other projects going on in your school at the present time? If so, describe them.
11. Is there anything else you would like to say?
12. If you think of other things after I leave, please do not hesitate to call me at MI. 3-0800, extension 3741.

Parent

Warm-up questions:

1. How many children do you have in school?
2. How old are they?
3. What schools are they attending?
4. What grades are they in?

Ask the following questions about each child in the family who is in school:

5. What are your biggest worries about your child's education? Is there any way the school could help as it is now? As you think it should be?
6. Do you think the school is really helping your child? If so, how? If not, why?
7. How well is your child doing in school?
8. What would you like your child to be when he is older? Why do you want him to become that?
9. How do you feel about your child's becoming a teacher?

Ask the following questions about each school which is attended by members of the family:

10. What do you like about your child's school? (Probe: Can you think of anything else?)
11. What do you dislike about your child's school? (Probe: Can you think of anything else?)
12. What do you think should be done about these problems? (Note: refer back to each problem mentioned.)
13. Of the problems you mention, what three are the most critical?
14. Does your child do homework at home? If so, does he ask you to help him? Do you check over his homework before he takes it to school?
15. How does your child feel about his teacher?
16. Have you met your child's teacher? (If no, ask:) Do you plan meeting her?
17. (If answer to #16 is yes, ask:) What do you like about her? Why? What do you dislike about her? Why?

Closing questions:

18. How would you like to become involved in the school program?
19. Are there things about the school that we haven't asked you that you would like to tell us about? (Probe: Can you think of anything else?)
20. If other things come to mind after I leave that you would like to share with us, please do not hesitate to call me at MI. 3-0800, extension 3741.

Staff

(Clerk, Engineer, Lunchroom Manager, Janitor, Truant Officer,
Community Representative, Teacher Nurse)

1. Would you describe your job? (This is a warm-up question; data are not important.)
2. Tell me about some of the programs in this school that are particularly good.
3. What are some of your persistent problems? (Pick up each problem as it is mentioned and ask questions a., b., c., and d. if not included in response.)
   a. Why do you think this problem exists?
   b. What have you tried to do about it?
   c. Have you received any help in solving this problem? If so, where did this help come from? How, specifically, did it help?
   d. What additional resources would you like to have to solve this problem? How would you use these resources?
4. Of the problems you have mentioned, what three do you feel are the most critical?
5. If you had a voice in the control of this school, how would you change it?
6. What other things come to mind that we haven't mentioned which you feel ought to be considered by the project staff? What other questions do you think I might have asked you?
7. If you think of other things after I leave, please do not hesitate to call me at MI. 3-0800, extension 3741.

Suggestion to interviewer: Become very familiar with this schedule. Do not repeat questions if they have been answered earlier.

END
3-17-69